DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 272 RC 011 885

TITLE	Trends in Segregation of Hispanic Students in Major School Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollment. Analytic Report, Volume III-A. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Aspira, Inc., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	30 Nov 79
GRANT	NIE-G-780226
NOTE	146p.: For related documents, see RC 011 883-884 and RC 011 886-888.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education; *Blacks; Desegregation Effects; Discipline; Dropout Rate; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment Trends; Equal Education; Grade Repetition; High School Graduates; *Hispanic Americans; Integration Studies; Language Arts; *Minority Group Teachers; Public Schools; School Districts; *School Policy; *School Segregation; Special Education; *Special Programs

ABSTRACT

Analysis of 1968-76 data from the Office of Civil Rights indicated that Hispanics were highly segregated between school systems and between schools within systems. In 1976, nearly 80% of all the Hispanics enrolled in United States schools were enrolled in less than 5% of the nation's school districts, a level of segregation nearly twice that of blacks for the same year. Segregation was more severe at the elementary school level. Only modest relationships existed between segregation and participation in school programs (such as bilingual education or special education programs) and practices (such as grade retention and disciplinary action). Hispanic staff was found to be concentrated in more segregated schools and as separated from non-Hispanic staff as were Hispanic students from non-Hispanic students. Blacks were more segregated than Hispanics between schools and across school systems but black segregation had decreased more. Indications were that black desegregation had adversely affected Hispanic desegregation, which did not change dramatically during the eight years covered by the study. (SL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190272

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: RC UD
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

VOLUME III-A

ANALYTIC REPORT

TRENDS IN SEGREGATION OF HISPANIC STUDENTS IN MAJOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS HAVING LARGE HISPANIC ENROLLMENT

FEB 1980
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

FINAL REPORT

November 30, 1979

Project Director: Abdin Noboa

Prepared in Conjunction with DBS Corporation

Under Subcontract to

ASPIRA OF AMERICA, INC.

GRANT NUMBER: NIE-G-780226

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ABDIN NOBOA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RC011885

PREFACE

As with descriptive studies of this nature, Aspira may be strongly criticized for insufficiently advocating one particular perspective as opposed to another. The purpose of this project is to document the trends that exist in desegregation among Hispanos. While much is contained in these volumes, it is but a beginning effort at documentation and is certainly not as sufficiently analytical as the data would warrant. The scope of the study prohibited the latter from the outset.

Since some of our statistical compilation is based on the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) Elementary and Secondary Education Survey (forms 101 and 102) we must caution, from the outset that the accuracy of this data base has been strongly criticised by the Children's Defense Fund, other advocacy organizations, and local educational practitioners in our various communities. Our generalizations are as good as the data from which they are derived and our funds were insufficient to assess their reliability. Notwithstanding, inasmuch as Federal penalties can be levied against the willful misreporting of student counts, we are confident that, for the most part, the data is reasonably accurate for our projections. It is also the only comprehensive national data base containing race and national origin categories for elementary and secondary school age children.

We are very concerned about the misrepresentation of our data in subsequent articles. The careless proliferation of research findings sometimes makes this unavoidable from those who wish to make a point, irregardless of what the data may indicate. Although we cannot control this practice, we would like to make several issues very clear: 1) Aspira is not advocating for or against desegregation in this series of volumes; it simply reports the condition of education for Hispanic children within the context of desegregation. 2) It is not advocating separatism in support for maintenance of bilingual education programs. The data does not indicate these are mutually exclusive processes. 3) We support the enhancement of equitable services which increase the educational advancement of Hispanic children. If and when school desegregation efforts and other educational policies negatively impact on these ends, we must question the efficacy of these efforts for our children. 4) We must stress that desegregation need not be antithetical to bilingual education or against special services for Hispanic children, although in some instances, practice has clearly made it so.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Abstract..... 1

II. Introduction and Summary of Findings..... 3

Segregation trends for Hispanos..... 5
Relationship between segregation and school practices..... 7
Comparison of Hispanic and black segregation trends..... 12

III. Description of the Study..... 13

Limitations..... 14
Sources of data..... 16
Universe and samples of districts..... 26
Indices of segregation..... 27
Analyses of trends..... 31

IV. Trends in Segregation of Hispanic students..... 35

National trends..... 35
Regional trends..... 50
Trends in districts having large Hispanic enrollment..... 74
Projections..... 87

V. Relationship between Hispanic Segregation and Specific School Practices..... 90

Bilingual education..... 92
Special education..... 97
Disciplinary action..... 109
Retention in grade, graduation, and dropping out..... 111
Segregation and Hispanic professional staff..... 113

VI. Comparison of trends in Segregation of Hispanic and Black Students..... 117

National trends..... 117
Regional trends..... 121
Trends in districts having large Hispanic enrollment..... 128
Tri-ethnic district composition and patterns of segregation.... 132

VII. Recommendations for Policy and Future Research..... 135

Policy recommendations..... 135
Areas for further research..... 138
Summary and conclusions..... 142

Appendices (Volume III-B)

Appendix A..... 1
Appendix B..... 10
Appendix C..... 27

CHAPTER 1

ABSTRACT

This report describes trends in "within-district segregation" of Hispanic public elementary and secondary school students between 1968 and 1976. Data collected by or on behalf of the U.S. Office for Civil Rights for school districts of 3,000 or more students and 5% or more Hispanic enrollment, were analyzed, and various aspects of segregation were explored by use of several indices of segregation. Segregation in the nation as a whole, in specific regions, and in the ten school districts having the largest Hispanic enrollments was examined.

This study discusses the relationship between segregation of Hispanic students and their involvement in bilingual education programs, special education programs, and disciplinary action, as well as their rates of school dropout, retention in grade, and graduation from high school. In addition, the relationship between presence of Hispanic professional staff and segregation of Hispanos was explored.

Finally, segregation of Hispanos was compared with segregation of blacks. These comparisons examine the differences in level of segregation as well as the different trends for the two racial groups. In addition, one district in which desegregation of blacks appeared to lead to an increase in segregation of Hispanos was analyzed.

CHAPTER II

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Segregation is the separation of racial/ethnic groups from each other. Separation of such groups by design is a violation of the law. Although much segregation has been eliminated, vestiges of former segregation remain. Also, new areas of concern have arisen. In many parts of this country racial groups have lived and continue to live in distinct neighborhoods. This type of residential segregation has had a direct effect on the separation of racial groups in our nation's public schools. As Hispanos continue to grow in this nation, and as demographics of major population groups continue to change across the country, it is important to focus on desegregation trends within this national origin group.*

Public education in this country is the responsibility of State and local governments. Systems of public education generally are affiliated with local governments and are defined to serve particular local areas (e.g. county, township, city, or borough). Within each school district, schools also are described in terms of a local attendance area. An elementary school usually provides education for children in one neighborhood, while a secondary (or intermediate) school provides education for students in neighborhoods served by several elementary schools. School officials' definition of attendance areas and residential segregation are major factors in school segregation today.

Segregation can occur between school systems, between individual schools and between individual classes (e.g. tracking). Segregation occurs between

*For purposes of this study, previous volumes have already established Hispanos as a racial and a national origin group.

schools within the same school district, if the areas served by the schools are separate geographical areas having distinct racial groups.

Further segregation can occur between classes within a school. Specialized instruction (e.g., bilingual education or special education) may be practicable only if the students requiring the instruction are grouped in one class. When this instruction is directed toward a particular racial group, this group will be separated from other groups in the school. Similarly, "ability" grouping can separate students by racial groups as a result of disparate levels of achievement.

These three types of segregation--between systems, between schools, and between classes--may or may not be illegal. Segregation that results from actions taken by a local government (in defining school systems) or by a school district (in locating schools and defining service areas) on the basis of the racial composition of the areas served is illegal. Similarly, assignment of students to classes within a school on the basis of the race-ethnicity of the students is illegal. The legality of decisions that are made on some other basis and result in segregation must be separately determined by the courts (refer to Volume I).

This study examines segregation of Hispanic students in public school systems from 1968 to 1976. The extent of segregation, changes in segregation over time, and the apparent relationship between segregation and school practices are examined in this volume. Our analysis will focus on describing the levels of segregation over this eight year period. It does not systematically examine the causes of increase or decrease in segregation, nor does it evaluate the legality of segregation for Hispanos in the school districts analyzed. The fact that a particular school district is highly segregated or shows increased segregation, does not necessarily mean that the school

district is in violation of the law.

Segregation Trends for Hispanos

Hispanic students comprise the third largest racial group in the nation's schools. Hispanos are highly segregated between school systems: in 1976, nearly 80% of all Hispanos in the nation's schools were enrolled in fewer than 5% of the nation's school districts.* These same school systems enrolled fewer than one-fourth of all students in the nation. Furthermore, Hispanos were, in 1976, the single largest minority group in these districts, representing 23% of the total student population. These Hispanic students were somewhat younger than either black or white students in these systems. Hence, if present trends continue, larger proportions of all Hispanic students will be enrolled in this small group of districts with smaller proportions of all other-race students.

In addition to this high level of segregation between school systems, Hispanos have experienced segregation between schools within school districts. Within-school segregation of Hispanos may increase in the near future due to population figures which indicate a greater gross reproduction rate among Hispanos than for blacks or whites, and due to the increasing mobility of whites away from these same school districts. Hispanic segregation in elementary schools is more severe than in secondary schools because elementary schools serve more restricted areas and because school officials have been more reluctant to desegregate elementary schools than higher level schools. As the somewhat younger Hispanic student population

*This level of segregation between school systems is nearly twice the level for blacks in 1976.

progresses through the grades, secondary schools may also experience higher levels of segregation.

Hispanos are isolated from whites in both elementary and secondary schools. In 1968, 65% of all Hispanic elementary school students and 53% of all Hispanic secondary school students were in predominantly minority schools.* By 1976 this had risen to 74% in elementary schools and 65% in secondary schools. As the number of white students in the schools continues to decrease and the number of minority students to increase, these proportions of Hispanos in predominantly minority schools will continue to increase.

When the loss of white students from the schools is taken into account, a somewhat different picture of segregation from whites emerges: segregation has decreased slightly from 1968 to 1976, and most of the decrease occurred in the early part of this time period. To adjust for the loss of whites, the proportion of whites in school with the average Hispanic child is related to the proportion of whites in the school system.** Although slightly more than half the school districts in the country with 5% Hispanic enrollment or above showed a total decrease in segregation (albeit slight), most of the school systems within this category showed an initial decrease in segregation followed by no change, or in a substantial number of districts, a subsequent increase in segregation from 1972 to 1976. Therefore, although the relative measure of segregation from whites indicates some desegregation of Hispanos, this trend has been lessening. Progression from

---

*These are schools in which minority group children constitute 50% or more of the enrollment.

**Though the average level of segregation of Hispanos, when using this relative measure has declined, due to the substantial increase in Hispanic enrollment, the actual number of Hispanos in highly segregated districts has increased.

the last eight years predicts increased segregation in the near future.

Segregation of Hispanos from blacks in 1976 exceeded segregation in 1968, even after compensating for the proportion of blacks in the school systems. Present projections indicate that Hispanic segregation from blacks will probably continue to increase.

Relationship Between Segregation and School Practices

One of the principal reasons for concern about segregation in the public schools is the belief that minority groups in segregated systems do not receive equal treatment. This study addressed this concern by examining the relationship between level of segregation of Hispanos (between schools in a school system) and Hispanic participation for several school programs, practices, and educational outcomes. These include: participation in English language instruction; special education programs; discipline, as measured by rates of suspension and expulsion; grade retention as measured by rates of high school graduation and number of dropouts; and staffing patterns.

The study found some modest relationships between level of segregation and participation in some school practices. However, the analysis performed did not address the strength of the relationship nor control for other characteristics of the school systems that could be significant for participation in the programs. Thus, although relationships were found, the analysis will not support a finding that segregation is the sole factor nor necessarily a significant factor in determining participation in the school practices examined.*

*Although the data are available, insufficient funding and time prohibited additional research needed.

Language Instruction

Students who may need bilingual education or programs in English as a second language (ESL) are more likely to participate in these programs in highly segregated school systems. Nationwide, more than one-fourth of all Hispanic students may have limited English speaking ability (LESA) which is inferred from the use of a language other than English at home. Fewer than 2% of all non-Hispanic students also had non-English backgrounds. Thus, nearly 84% of all LESA students are Hispanos. Of the students possibly needing instruction, 47% of Hispanos and 36% of non-Hispanos in low segregated districts receive some form of special language instruction (either bilingual education or ESL). These figures increased with the level of segregation: in relatively highly segregated systems 57% of the Hispanos and 65% of the non-Hispanos who may need special language instruction received the instruction. It appears that segregation highlights the need for special language programs, serves as an incentive for implementing these programs, and facilitates provision of the programs.

Special Education

Racial, cultural, and language differences between minorities and non-minorities may cause inappropriate and disproportionate numbers of minorities to be identified as handicapped, particularly in school systems where minorities are not segregated. If this were a significant problem for Hispanos, the reported incidence of a handicapped condition among Hispanos would be higher than the incidence among non-Hispanos in less segregated school systems. When special education programs as a group are considered, there appears to be some evidence of this problem, but only in districts having relatively low levels of segregation.

The reported incidence of mental retardation (whether educable or trainable) for Hispanos exceeded that for non-Hispanos in less segregated school systems, while the incidence of specific learning disabilities for Hispanos exceeded that for non-Hispanos in school systems having both relatively high and relatively low levels of segregation. Since these same school systems have somewhat lower incidence of identified language difficulties than do moderately segregated systems, there may be some confusion of language problems with specific learning disabilities.

For all other reported handicap conditions, participation in programs among Hispanos consistently differed from the participation among non-Hispanos at all levels of segregation (higher in physical/sensory or health related programs, and lower in programs for psychological or emotional handicaps and for gifted/talented students).

Segregation may affect the delivery of special education services to the various racial groups differently. And since service delivery problems affect the identification and assessment of handicaps, and the provision of special education, the reported incidence of handicap conditions by level of segregation could vary between minorities and non-minorities. There was some evidence of these problems for the nation as a whole: the reported incidence of mental retardation varied differently for Hispanos and non-Hispanos by level of segregation. Incidence for non-Hispanos increased with increasing segregation, but among Hispanos the greatest incidence occurred in school systems having relatively moderate levels of segregation. The drop of incidence in more highly segregated systems may have resulted from service delivery problems in these systems. However, since moderately segregated systems had higher proportions of Hispanos with language problems than did districts having lower or higher

levels of segregation, this also may have been a result of confounding language problems with mental retardation.

Discipline

The proportion of Hispanos suspended was lower than the proportion of non-Hispanos suspended regardless of the level of segregation. However, the variation in suspension rates by level of segregation differed for Hispanos and non-Hispanos. For both groups, the lowest rates occurred in highly segregated districts. However, Hispanic suspension rates were highest in moderately segregated systems while non-Hispanic rates were highest in less segregated systems. Since moderately segregated districts also had the highest proportion of Hispanos with language problems, this suggests that cultural differences may be construed as behavioral problems that require mild disciplinary action. Alternately, the language differences may have increased interracial strife among students, leading to mild disciplinary action.

Grade Retention

If desegregation improves the education provided in a school system, measures of educational outcome should also improve. It is usually assumed that in a desegregated system the educational environment is better and that this will result in lower rates of retention in grade and dropping out and higher rates of graduation from high school. However, if the sesegregated environment leads to an increase in disciplinary problems or a feeling of alienation and discrimination, dropout rates may increase.

Rates of retention in grade were generally higher for Hispanos. Moreover, while non-Hispanic retention accelerated with increased segregation, Hispanic retention was highest in moderately segregated school sys-

tems. This suggests that, in general, desegregation improves retention rates. For Hispanos, the improvement in retention from desegregation may be overshadowed by the effect of language differences, common to Hispanos in moderately segregated districts. High school graduation rates generally were lower for Hispanos than for non-Hispanos. Yet, rates improved for both groups as segregation decreased. Hence, desegregation may have a beneficial effect on educational outcomes in that larger proportions of students complete secondary education and graduate in less segregated systems.

Dropout rates, however, appear to be adversely affected by desegregation: the relatively more segregated school system had somewhat lower dropout rates. This was particularly true for Hispanos—only in the highly segregated school systems were dropout rates for Hispanos lower than those for non-Hispanos. At the same time, the rates for both groups were higher in moderately segregated systems. This suggests that increased interracial strife or the different nature of the school environment may produce feelings of alienation or discrimination which lead to a higher dropout proportion. This follows a similar pattern to suspension rates.

Staffing

The presence of Hispanic professional staff is important for Hispanic students. Hispanic staff may provide role models for students, which may lead to fewer behavioral problems and increased desire to complete school. In addition, the presence of Hispanic staff can help reduce feelings of alienation or discrimination among Hispanic students.

This study examined the location of Hispanic staff with respect to the location of Hispanic students by level of segregation in the school systems. When aggregate figures by level of segregation are considered, the higher

numbers and proportions of Hispanic staff generally were found where there were higher numbers and proportions of Hispanic students. Moreover, higher proportion of Hispanic staff were found in school systems that, in aggregate, had more active programs for bilingual education or English as a second language. Although this may be beneficial for bilingual (or ESL) and other special programs, it also indicates separation of Hispanic staff from non-Hispanic instructors.

Comparison of Hispanic and Black Segregation Trends

Comparison of segregation of blacks and segregation of Hispanos highlights differences in the history and focus of segregation for blacks and Hispanos. Blacks are more segregated than Hispanos between schools and across school systems, but segregation of blacks has decreased more (or increased less) than segregation of Hispanos in the school systems.

There are indications that the desegregation of black students has adversely affected segregation of Hispanic students. The concentration on desegregation of blacks and whites has led to increased segregation of Hispanos. By addressing one social ill to the exclusion of other groups of students, the nation indirectly [illegible]ered increased segregation of Hispanic students.

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

This study examined within-district segregation of Hispanos in public elementary and secondary school districts between 1968 and 1976. Segregation in the nation as a whole, in regions, and in school districts having large Hispanic enrollments was examined by using several measures of segregation. The apparent effects of segregation on a variety of school practices were examined, and the relationship between segregation of Hispanos and segregation of blacks was explored.

Previous segregation studies primarily concentrated on segregation of blacks or all minorities as a group. Studies that examined segregation of Hispanos were limited by small sample size or use of only one measure of segregation. This study concentrated on segregation of Hispanos and used large samples; thus the findings represent the environment of the "average" Hispanic student in the nation's public schools. In addition, a variety of measures were used so that various forms of segregation and a variety of policy issues could be evaluated.

The Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Surveys conducted by the Office for Civil Rights have provided a wealth of information about school practices and special programs, but analyses of these data rarely has considered the relationship between segregation and these practices.

In addition, studies of segregation of specific minority groups rarely have explored the relationship between segregation of one group and desegregation of another. Does desegregation of blacks, for example, affect desegregation of Hispanos? Under what circumstances? This study provided for direct comparison of segregation of blacks and segregation of Hispanos, and the ap-

parent effects of desegregation of one group on the other.

Limitations

The main limitation of this study is its descriptive nature. This report describes segregation trends for Hispanos, but no attempt has been made to explain factors contributing to segregation. It also describes the relationship between segregation and school practices (Chapter V), but similarly, has not attempted to establish a cause/effect relationship between the two. While trends over time are presented, most relationships are examined cross-sectionally, which limits our ability to assess causality.

Comparisons of trends in Hispanic and black segregation (Chapter VI) was limited by the use of the same universe and sample for both groups. The study was limited to school districts that enrolled at least 3,000 sudents and at least 5% Hispanos. The universe and sample definitions were developed to provide extensive coverage of Hispanos, but not blacks; nearly three-fourths of all Hispanos in the nation's schools, but only one-fourth of blacks were included among these school districts. Consequently, it is likely that the segregation trends reported for blacks are not as accurate as those reported for Hispanos. Funding limitations did not permit analyses of a comparable group of districts where blacks constituted 5% enrollment or above. Further research should duplicate the analyses of segregation for blacks.

Although these districts enrolled approximately 77% of all Hispanos in the nation, the coverage in some regions was less extensive. Coverage in the Midwest was the worst; in that region approximately 40% of Hispanos were enrolled in districts excluded from the study. Consequently, the extent of segregation in that region may be misstated.

Finally, the quality and accuracy of the data may affect the validity

of the report. The surveys providing data for this study were well designed and executed and data editing was quite good. However, minor inconsistencies were detected. The aggregate of school-level data did not agree with the district-level data in approximately 10% of all districts in 1972 and 1% of all districts in 1976. In these instances the aggregate school-level data were used. Since in the vast majority of cases (over 90%) the inconsistencies involved fewer than 1/2 of 1% of the students enrolled, the enrollment data almost certainly are accurate. No other attempt was made to validate data provided in the surveys. In some cases (e.g., special education) systematic reporting problems may have affected the validity of the data; documentation of the OCR surveys should be consulted for descriptions of these problems.

All of the data used for this study were self-reported by schools and school districts to a regulatory agency of the Federal Government. Reported data rarely are validated by on-site investigation. Nonetheless, there is no reason to believe that schools or school districts have falsified the data reported. (Severe penalties are imposed for false or misleading reports.) A potential limitation of the study, within these constraints, is the failure of schools or school districts to report data. It is possible that some of the information requested was not available at the time and was omitted. No estimate of the extent of this problem is available.

These analyses were by no means simple. The use of several measures of segregation necessitated lengthy and complex discussions of segregation trends. Moreover, the variety of issue areas explored necessitated broad-brush treatment of some. Nonetheless, the analyses represents a major contribution to knowledge and understanding of Hispanic segregation, its characteristics and its effects.

Sources of Data

This study used data provided by the Office for Civil Rights, which conducts biennial surveys of public elementary and secondary school districts to obtain information required for enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1972. In 1976, staffing information was collected for the Office for Civil Rights by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) provided all data used for this study.

OCR Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Surveys

The principal source of information for this study were OCR's 1968, 1972, and 1976 Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Surveys. (Data collected in the 1970 and 1974 surveys were initially examined and their small contribution to trend evaluation did not warrant the extra cost.)

Sampling Methodology: In OCR's 1968 and 1972 surveys, the same method was used to select the samples. School districts were assigned to one of four strata on the basis of most recent enrollment data available at the time of selection. A simple random sample of each stratum was drawn so that each district in a stratum had an equal probability of selection. (See table III.1 for strata definitions and sampling fractions.)

The sample listing then was compared with a separate list, the forced district list, which included all districts operating under a voluntary or compulsory desegregation plan. Districts on the forced district list not included in the original sample were added to the sample listing. However,

these districts carried a zero weight and had no effect on the estimates made from the surveys. All selected districts submitted summary (district-level) information as well as information for each school in the district (school-level information).

In 1976, a different sampling method was used to satisfy OCR's requirements for the forced selection of specific districts and the requirement to estimate population statistics. Each district was assigned a selection probability based on characteristics of the district and specific OCR requirements: forced districts were assigned a probability of 1.0, while other districts were assigned a probability based on several criteria (e.g., expected value of minority coverage for the survey should exceed 75%). Each district was independently selected for inclusion in the sample survey with a probability equal to the assigned probability. All districts in the nation were required to submit summary information. Only those districts selected for the sample were required to submit information for each school in the district.

Survey Instruments: OCR's Elementary and Secondary Surveys gather information by means of two survey instruments—form OS/CR-101 to collect district-level information and form OS/CR-102 to collect information about each school (campus) in the district. In 1976, district-level information was obtained from all school districts in the nation, and school-level information was obtained from a sample of districts. For 1968 and 1972 surveys, both types of information were collected only from the sampled districts.

The specific information requested on these forms differed dramatically from survey to survey. Table III.2 shows types of information collected each year, and as can be seen, enrollment data were collected each year, but

the school practices for which information was collected varied from year to year. Consequently, segregation trends could be evaluated for each year, but examination of the relationship between segregation and a particular school practice was limited to the year(s) for which information about that practice was collected.

The racial categories for which data were collected changed through the years. Table III.3 gives the definitions used each year. In 1968 and 1972 the definitions of racial categories suggested several methods for classifying a student. Specifically, students could classify themselves or could be identified by the school or the community. The precise method of identification used by schools and school districts is not known. These changes had no perceptible effect on the data provided.*

TABLE III.1

Strata definitions and sampling fractions used in 1968 and 1972 OCR Elementary and Secondary Schools Civil Rights Surveys

Strata	School district enrollment	Sampling fraction
	More than 3,000	1.00
	1,200 to 2,999	0.75
	600 to 1,199	0.50
	300 to 599	0.25

*The primary effect expected from changes in the definitions was an unexpected increase in Hispanic enrollment, accompanied by decreased enrollment of whites. However, an evaluation of aggregate enrollment data for a matched set of districts showed enrollment for Hispanos and whites to be linearly related to year ($R \geq .98$).

TABLE III.2

Data used from the OCR surveys

Type of information	Year of survey 1968	1972	1976
IDENTIFICATION			
OE code for district	X	X	X
Name of district or school	X	X	X
COMPLIANCE INDICATOR			
Voluntary plan	X	X	X
Court ordered	X	X(1)	X
Litigation	-	X(1)	X
All other districts			
Forced	-	-	X
Drawn	-	-	X
ENROLLMENT			
Number of schools	X	X	X
Enrollment			
American Indian	X	X	X
Black	X	X	X
Asian	X	X	X
Hispanic (or equivalent)	X	X	X
White (majority)	X	X	X
Total	-	-	X
BILINGUAL INSTRUCTION			
Number of pupils...			
Whose home language is not English	-	-	X(3)
Who receive bilingual education or ESL	-	X	X
By race ethnicity	-	-	X
Total	-	X	X
EMPLOYMENT (by race/ethnicity)			
Full-time principals	X	X	-(5)
Full-time assistant principals	X	X(4)	-
Full-time classroom teachers	X	X(4)	-
Full-time other instructional	X	X	-
DISCIPLINE (by race/ethnicity)			
Expulsions	-	X	X(6)
Suspensions	-	-	X(6)
Other discipline	-	-	X(6)
SPECIAL EDUCATION(2)			
EMR or EMH	-	-	X
TMR or TMH	-	-	X
Emotionally disturbed, etc.	-	-	X
Physical, health, etc.	-	-	X
Specific learning disabled	-	-	X
Total	-	-	X
Gifted/Talented	-	-	X
RETENTION AND COMPLETION/TRANSFERS			
Graduates	-	-	X(2)
Dropouts	-	-	X(2)
Retained	-	X(2)	-

(1) Expanded breakout of court ordered and litigation is available

(2) Provided at school level

(3) 1976 survey provided full racial/ethnic breakout

(4) Principals and assistant principals must not be classroom teachers

(5) For 1976 employment data was obtained from the EEO-5 survey data provided by OCR for the districts

(6) Expulsions and suspensions were not distinguished in the 1976 survey

TABLE III.3

Definitions of racial/ethnic categories used in OCR surveys

Category/Year of survey	Definition
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	
1968, 1972	American Indian: Persons considered by themselves, by the school, or by the community to be of American Indian origin
1976	American Indian or Alaskan Native: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America
Black, not Hispanic*	
1968, 1972	Negro: Persons considered by themselves, by the school, or by the community to be of African or Negro origin.
1976	Black, not of Hispanic origin: A person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa.
Asian or Pacific Islander	
1968, 1972	Oriental: Persons considered by themselves, by the school, or by the community to be of Chinese, Japanese, or other Oriental origin.
1976	Asian or Pacific Islander: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Pacific Islands. This area includes, for example, China, Japan, Korea, the Philippine Islands, and Samoa.
Hispanic*	
1968, 1972	Spanish-Surnamed American: Persons considered by by themselves, by the school, or by the community to be of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Central American, Cuban, Latin American, or other Spanish origin.
1976	Hispanic: A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin—regardless of race.
White	
1968, 1972	Other: All individuals not included above.
1976	White, not of Hispanic origin: A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, the Middle East, or the Indian subcontinent.

*Aspira has taken the liberty to use the word "Hispano" as the proper noun. "Hispanic" is only used as an adjective. While this deviates from OMB and the Federal Interagency Committee on Education (FICE) classifications, it is a more accurate designation.

Universe and Samples of Districts

Universe

To reduce a huge data base to a more manageable size, this study examined Hispanic segregation only in the universe of school districts having 3,000 or more pupils and 5% or greater Hispanic enrollment. This permitted exclusion of a large number of districts that enrolled relatively few Hispanic students. The universe was established separately for each year studied; since total enrollment and Hispanic enrollment varied from year to year, districts in the universe one year might be excluded the next, and so forth. The 1968 and 1972 OCR surveys included nearly all districts in the universe. The 1976 survey collected school-level data from 62% of all school districts in the country and thus limited our Hispanic sample of school districts for school-level data. Table III.4 shows summary enrollment statistics for the nation and universe for each year studied.

From this table, the number of systems and schools in the universe, as well as enrollment for each minority, increased each year. The enrollment of whites in these districts increased from 1968 to 1972 but then declined. This decline was offset by increases in minority enrollment so that there was a steady rise in percentage enrollment of each minority in these districts.

Samples

This research project examined segregation in five samples of school districts from the universe:

- Sample I: Entire OCR sample of districts enrolling 3,000 or more students and having 5% or more Hispanic enrollment which reported school-level data
- Sample II: Ten school districts with largest Hispanic enrollment.
- Sample III: Limited case study sample
- Sample IV: Ethnographic study sample
- Sample V: Matched sample

TABLE III.4

Enrollment in the nation,[1] the universe,[2] and Sample I in each year

Year of survey	Number of districts	Number of schools	Students, by racial/ethnic group					
			American Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Black	White	All students
1968								
Nation	11,498	79,702	177,463	194,022	2,002,776	6,282,173	34,697,101	44,910,422
Universe	431	10,374	28,586	118,202	1,520,129	1,549,128	4,983,006	8,199,056
Sample I	428	10,351	28,404	118,106	1,516,318	1,548,973	4,976,307	8,188,108
1972								
Nation	11,736	82,236	232,765	233,189	2,414,154	6,796,210	34,970,000	44,646,318
Universe[2]	507	12,429	36,670	136,413	1,872,395	1,861,181	5,140,665	9,047,230
Sample I	509	12,525	37,924	136,452	1,885,681	1,857,450	5,196,233	9,113,740
1976								
Nation	11,617	78,275	346,362	633,753	2,784,857	6,761,310	32,779,643	43,205,915
Universe	560	13,464	59,775	353,263	2,203,676	2,127,260	4,943,918	9,687,882
Sample I	345	12,602	46,238	324,151	1,938,645	2,008,374	3,628,264	7,945,662

[1] National enrollment figures are for all school districts with 300 or more students enrolled.

[2] Enrollment for the universe is projected by using reported data from Sample I districts for 1968 and 1972. In 1972, approximately 5 districts had zero sampling weights and did not contribute to the universe estimates. Consequently, the universe data for 1972 is sometimes lower than the aggregate of the Sample I data.

[3] Enrollment for the universe in 1976 is an actual count of students using district-level reports

Data from districts in samples I, II, and V are described in this report. Districts in sample III were used to examine certain district-level changes; analysis of that data is reported in a separate report. Sample IV districts were sites for ethnographic studies described in volume II of these reports.

Sample I: Entire OCR sample. This sample was the one used most extensively for the analyses reported in this document. It included all districts enrolling 3,000 or more students and having 5% or more Hispanic enrollment which provided school-level data in the Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey.

Table III.4 also shows the number of districts, schools, and students covered by Sample I. Although sample I surveyed only 3% to 4% of schools described earlier rather than a sample of all the nation's school districts, results from sample I technically should be used to make inferences about the universe rather than the nation as a whole. But since the universe included a large percentage of the nation's Hispanos, inferences about Hispanos in the universe are likely to be fairly accurate statements about Hispanic students in the entire nation. In addition, sample I included almost all Hispanos in the universe in 1968 and 1972, and 88% of Hispanos in 1976;* consequently, the data has been treated as a census of the universe rather than as a sample (though it is referred to as sample I). Significance levels and confidence intervals are not reported.

*Despite the lower coverage in 1976, estimates for the universe are quite precise. The actual error of projected student enrollment falls between -1.75% and 2.25%.

Sample II: Ten school districts with the largest Hispanic enrollment.

Sample II was composed of the ten school districts having the largest Hispanic enrollments in the universe in the 1968 survey. These districts (in order by OE code) were:

(1) Los Angeles
(2) San Diego
(3) Denver
(4) Dade County (Miami)
(5) Hillsborough, FL (Tampa)
(6) Chicago
(7) Albuquerque, New Mexico
(8) New York City
(9) Dallas
(10) Houston

With the exception of Hillsborough, all were included in the universe all three years. Hillsborough County was included in 1968 and 1972, but not in 1976 because its Hispanic enrollment dropped below 5%. All these districts also provided school-level data for the Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Survey each year.

Table III.5 shows the coverage provided by sample II as a percentage of the universe. These districts accounted for between 36% and 38% of all Hispanos and for more than 50% of blacks in the universe.

TABLE III.5.

Percentage coverage of the universe provided by Sample II (10 largest school districts)

Year of survey	Schools	Students, by racial/ethnic group					
		American Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Black	White	All students
1968	31	25	41	38	66	34	41
1972	29	17	37	37	62	28	37
1976	26	18	24	36	54	23	33
Average	29	20	34	37	61	28	37

Sample III: Limited case study sample. This sample was made up of a sample of schools in 20 districts; the data submitted by these 808 schools in the 1968, 1972, and 1976 surveys will be used in an examination of the effects of segregation in individual schools within school districts. Analyses of data collected from sample III is not included in this volume.

Sample IV: Case study sample. Two districts--Eastville and Westville--received detailed ethnographic study. The results of these studies are contained in a separate report, Volume II.

Sample V: Matched sample. Since districts included varied from year to year, Sample I allowed for cross-sectional analyses and longitudinal studies of aggregate statistics. Therefore, a smaller matched sample was defined. Included in the matched sample were districts that were in the universe each year (1968, 1972, and 1976) and also provided school-level data each year. Hence, the matched sample was a subset of sample I in each year and contained those districts that were in sample I in all years.

Table III.6 shows numbers of students, schools, and districts covered by the matched sample and the percentage of the universe covered by this sample. As can be seen, the matched sample accounted for 80% or more of the Hispanic enrollment in the universe in all years. Moreover, the majority of all other students in the universe were also covered by this sample.

TABLE III.6

Numbers and percentage of universe included in matched sample

Year of survey	Districts	Schools	Students, by racial/ethnic group					
			American Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Black	White	All students
Number								
1968	247	7984	22709	104325	1296502	1462858	3799208	6685602
1972	247	8717	27138	113299	1553178	1644674	3404483	6742669
1976	247	8485	37466	180524	1749409	1638675	2860030	6466104
Percentage								
1968	57.31	76.96	79.44	88.26	85.29	94.43	76.24	81.64
1972	48.72	70.13	70.36	83.06	82.95	88.84	66.12	74.53
1976	44.11	63.02	62.68	61.10	79.39	77.03	67.85	66.74

Indices of Segregation

School segregation can be examined in several ways, depending on the measure used. In this study, three measures, or indices, were used to examine within-district segregation. This section describes only the indices used to measure segregation of Hispanos; comparable sets of indices were defined to measure segregation of blacks. A complete description of all indices considered for use is provided in appendix A.

The three indices of segregation were computed separately for three distinct groups of schools are defined in each district:

- All schools--All schools in a district regardless of grades offered.
- Elementary schools--All schools in a district in which the majority of grades offered were kindergarten through sixth.
- Secondary schools--All schools in a district in which the majority of the grades offered were seventh through twelfth.

When a school offered an equal number of grades defined as elementary and secondary, the school is not classified as either elementary or secondary, but was included in the all-schools total.

The three indices of segregation focused on different interpretations of the meaning of segregation. These are the Isolation Index (E), Dissimilarity Index (D), and Coleman's Index of Segregation (R).

Isolation Index (E)

This index measured the proportion of minority group children enrolled in predominately minority schools. Based on the definition of a minority group isolated school in the Emergency School Aid Act (P.L. 92-318) this index was:

> E(H,M,50%)--The proportion of Hispanic students (H) enrolled in schools in which minority group children (M) constituted 50% or more of the enrollment in the school.

This measure considers desegregation a process of eliminating predominantly minoritry schools in a school district. The higher the value of this index, the greater the segregation of Hispanos from nonminority students.

Coleman's Index of Segregation (R)

Several forms of this index have been described by Cisin, Pugh, and Coleman.* Both Cisin and Pugh describe an index to be used when there are only two racial/ethnic groups (e.g., Hispanic and non-Hispanic or minority and nonminority), while Coleman describes an index that measures segregation between two racial/ethnic groups (e.g., Hispano and white) regardless of the total number of identifiable racial/ethnic groups in the district. The rationales used to develop these indices are described by Zoloth** and Coleman. Coleman's has been adapted for use in this report.

Desegregation can be defined as a process by which students of one racial/ethnic group are mixed with those of another. A relevant measure of desegregation assesses the extent of mixture of two racial/ethnic groups. The extent of mixture can be measured by the proportion of other-race (e.g., black) students in school with the average minority (e.g., Hispano) student in a district. This is a direct measure of the experience of minority group students with other-race students. It does not indicate the extent of desegregation until it is normalized with respect to the maximum feasible

*Cisin, Ira. H. Statistical Indices of School Integration (Technical Memorandum 70-1). Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, Social Research Group, 1970.

Pugh, George. Criteria for Measurement of Integration Level (Paper 65). Arlington, Va.: Lambda Corporation, 1972.

Coleman, James S.; Kelly, Sara; and Moore, John. Trends in School Segregation, Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 1975.

**Zoloth, Barbara S. "Alternative Measure of School Segregation." Land Economics, August, 1976.

exposure to other-race students. In a fully desegregated school system, the average minority group student would be exposed to a proportion of other-race students equal to the district-wide proportion of other-race students.* Normalizing with respect to this maximum feasible exposure provides a segregation index having a linear scale, with zero indicating maximum desegregation and one indicating maximum segregation. In this normalized form, the Segregation Index provides a measure of the exposure between minority and other-race students that has not been achieved within the schools relative to the maximum feasible exposure.

Three variations of the Segregation Index were used to compare different groups of students:

R(H,NH)—The normalized form of the percent non-Hispanic (NH) in the school of the average Hispanic student (H),

R(H,W)—The normalized form of the percent white (W) in the school of the average Hispanic (H) student, and

R(H,B)—The normalized form of the percent black (B) in the school of the average Hispanic (H) student.

The first of these indices—R(H,NH)—is identical to the index described by Cisin and Pugh when Hispanos are used as the minority group; it may be interpreted as the proportion of the total variance in assigning Hispanos to schools attributable to segregation. The other two are analogous to indices described by Coleman.

For each of these segregation indices the higher the value of the index the greater the segregation. A zero value for R(H,NH) indicates no

*Districts having a low proportion of whites, for example, could not hope to achieve the same level of white-Hispanic mix that a district with a moderate proportion of whites could achieve. The potential for racial mix is highest when there are equal proportions of each group.

segregation of Hispanos from all others taken as one group.*

These measures consider desegregation a process of mixing students of different racial groups in the schools. These indices may show a high degree of segregation for one pair of racial/ethnic groups and low segregation for another pair. These indices do not consider whether or not the minority students are enrolled in predominantly minority group schools. For instance, a district that is 65% Hispano and 35% white (as defined in the OCR survey) and in which every school is 65% Hispano and 35% white would have an E index of 1.0 (very segregated) and an R index of 0.0 (no segregation). And a district that is 30% Hispano and 70% white and in which the schools vary from 0 to 49% Hispano would have an E index of 0.0 and an R index somewhere between .3 and .7.

Dissimilarity Index (D)

A Dissimilarity index measures the deviation of the actual assignment of students to schools from a particular assignment practice. This index is most applicable to studies of the impact of busing to effect desegregation. It measures the proportion of students who would need to be relocated (bused) to achieve a particular desegregation goal.

For this study the desegregation goal used for the Dissimilarity index was assignment of Hispanic students on the basis of school size. Achieving this goal would distribute Hispanos in a district such that the proportion of Hispanos in each school equals the district-wide proportion of Hispanos.

*Under certain conditions, negative values can be obtained for these indices. Negative values indicate a desegregated school system and are treated as zero.

D(H,T)--The proportion of Hispanic students (H) who would be assigned to different schools if the size (total enrollment, T) of each school were the only factor considered in assigning students to schools

A high value for this index indicates a large divergence, and a low value a small divergence from this assignment practice. This index does not depend on the number of students in predominantly minority schools, nor on the intermingling of any two racial groups. Continuing the examples, the school district with 65% Hispanic and 35% white in each school would have a D index of 0.0 (no segregation). The district with 30% Hispanic and 70% white with schools ranging from 0 to 49% in Hispanic composition could have a D index between .1 and .7.

Analyses of Trends

Analyses of national and regional trends examined the distribution of Hispanic students by characteristics of the school district:

. Large/Small

. Central city/Suburban/or Nonmetropolitan

. Largely Hispano/Largely black

. Desegregation under court order or voluntary plan

The analyses also examined changes in the distributions of Hispanos which may have affected trends.

Segregation trends were evaluated for each index of segregation. An estimate of the average index of segregation (i.e., the level of segregation experienced by the average Hispanic student in the universe) was developed for each index using sample I.* Averages were computed separately for elementary schools, secondary schools, and all schools. The degree, direction,

*See appendix B for a more detailed description of the method of computation.

and rate of change for the indices are described. The Isolation Index and the Dissimilarity Index were used to determine the numbers of Hispanos who were isolated or would be assigned to different schools, and changes in those numbers were compared with changes in Hispanic enrollment to provide an indication of the dynamics of student assignment.

In addition to examining changes in the indices, the proportions of Hispanic students exposed to different levels of segregation are described. School districts were categorized by level of segregation—low, moderate, or high—on each index of segregation. The levels were defined so that roughly equal numbers of districts were included in the three levels. The distribution of students by level of segregation was examined (see table III.7). Population shifts between levels of segregation are described and related to the observed trends.

Segregation trends in sample II districts were evaluated by inspection of the indices of segregation for each city. Desegregation activities in each city are related to the changes in the indices.

The matched sample (sample V) was used to explore the district-level changes which produced the trends observed in the nation or region. For example, the value of an index can decrease for the nation as a whole without decreasing in each district. The matched sample was used to determine what proportion of the districts showed changes similar to those shown for the entire nation.

TABLE III.7

Values for Levels of Segregation For Indices of Segregation

Index/Level	Range of value	
Isolation—E(H,M,50%)		
Low	0.0	.199
Medium	0.200	.699
High	0.700	1.000
Segregation—R(H,NH), R(H,W), R(H,B)		
Low	-1.0	.099
Medium	0.100	.199
High	0.200	1.000
Dissimilarity—D(H,T)		
Low	0.0	.099
Medium	0.100	.199
High	0.200	1.000

Relationship between segregation and specific school practices

The relationship between level of segregation and several school practices is described in chapter V. Segregation of Hispanos from non-Hispanos, R(H,NH), was used to establish the level of segregation for each district. For each level of segregation, the participation rates for Hispanos and non-Hispanos were computed by dividing the projected number of students participating in the program by the projected number of students enrolled in all schools.* Participation rates for Hispanos and non-Hispanos were compared, and any apparent relationship between segregation and Hispanic participation is described. The data and analyses are not suited to making inferences about causal relationships.

Comparison of Hispanic and black segregation

The comparison of Hispanic and black segregation trends used a group of indices for blacks comparable to those used for Hispanos (see appendix A). The development of the indices and averages paralleled the development for

Hispanos. National and regional averages were computed and compared with the averages for Hispanos. The discussion focuses on differences in the level of segregation and segregation trends for blacks and Hispanos. The population of blacks, however, is defined as only those blacks in school districts with 5 percent or above Hispanos. This is not a universe population of black students in all school districts.

---

*Projections are described in Appendix B.

CHAPTER IV

TRENDS IN SEGREGATION OF HISPANIC STUDENTS

National Trends

The national trends in segregation of Hispanic students described in this chapter are trends observed in the universe of school districts having significant Hispanic enrollment (specifically, districts enrolling more than 3,000 students and 5% or more Hispanic students). Less than 5% of all districts in the nation fell in this category. Collectively, these districts enrolled the majority of Hispanic students (66.18%) in the nation's public schools, but considerably smaller portions of blacks (31.46%) and whites (15.08%). This concentration of Hispanos suggests a considerable degree of between-district segregation of Hispanos from blacks and whites.

Table IV.1 gives aggregate enrollment data for the universe for each year studied. As can be seen, Hispanic and black enrollment in elementary and secondary schools increased substantially between 1968 and 1976. In contrast, white enrollment decreased over that period. Although white enrollment (all schools) increased between 1968 and 1972, the decrease over the next 4 years left enrollment below the 1968 level. This pattern of enrollment increase followed by a decrease was apparent in secondary schools, while white enrollment in elementary schools declined over both 4-year periods. Moreover, the rate of decline of white enrollment in elementary schools accelerated, with the decrease between 1972 and 1976 nearly twice that of the earlier period.

It is important to indicate that white "loss" can be caused by 1) decreases in white birth rate; 2) a 30-year trend of whites moving out of the

TABLE IV.1

Estimated Enrollment in the Universe (in millions)

School group/ year of survey	Hispanic Number	Hispanic %	Black Number	Black %	White Number	White %	All students
(1)							
All schools							
1968	1.518	19	1.537	19	4.981	61	8.183
1972	1.873	21	1.850	20	5.146	57	9.044
1976	2.154	22	2.165	23	4.853	51	9.586
Elementary schools							
1968	.952	20	.990	21	2.741	57	4.770
1972	1.110	23	1.082	22	2.617	53	4.906
1976	1.230	25	1.174	23	2.372	47	4.998
Secondary schools							
1968	.560	16	.537	16	2.218	66	3.374
1972	.733	18	.728	18	2.448	61	3.985
1976	.896	20	.939	21	2.407	54	4.429

(1)Figures for all schools do not equal the sum of elementary and secondary schools because schools offering equal numbers of grades classified in this study as elementary and secondary were not classified as either but were included in the totals for all schools.

Note: Enrollment for the universe is based on reported enrollment at the school level. Estimated enrollment figures in this table differ from those in Table III.4 because aggregates of "schools" reported for each district, instead of the reported "district" totals, were used.

central cities; 3) immigration of Hispanos into the central city; 4) migration of Hispanos within the U.S.; 5) white flight from desegregation; and (6) any combination of the above. Other reasons can be postulated. The point being that sometimes our references to loss of whites is in reference to their absolute number, while at other times it simply reflects change in overall white percent of total city population.

Table IV.1 also shows the composition of the universe. As can be seen, the proportion of Hispanos and blacks in the universe increased during the period studied. For all schools, the percentages of Hispanos and blacks were roughly equal and showed nearly equal rates of increase. The percentage of whites in the universe decreased, from 61% in 1968 to 51% in 1976. The percentage white was lower in elementary schools (dropping to 47% in 1976) and higher in secondary schools (54% in 1976).

These enrollment trends suggest that the universe of districts will not be majority white by the late 1970s. In addition, as Hispanos in elementary schools progress into secondary schools, Hispanos are likely to become the largest minority group in these districts.

Table IV.2 shows the distribution of Hispanic students by various characteristics of the school district. The majority of Hispanos were in large districts, central city districts, and districts having high proportions of Hispanos; this indicates a high degree of segregation of Hispanos between districts. However, the slight shift toward districts having low proportions of Hispanos, suggests that between-district segregation is decreasing slowly. More than 90% of Hispanos were in districts having low or moderate proportions of blacks, and more than half of these were in districts having low percentages of blacks. In 1968, relatively few

Hispanos were in districts that were desegregating by court order or voluntary plan: the proportion in court-ordered districts increased from 4% in 1968 to 19% in 1972, then remained constant through 1976; the proportion in voluntary-plan district dropped in 1972, then increased in 1976 to exceed 1968 levels.

Table IV.3 shows estimates of the average index of segregation for the indices used in this study. In general, segregation in elementary schools was greater than segregation in secondary schools. This difference probably was due to the prevalence of neighborhood elementary schools and limitations on transportation of students to schools far away from home; elementary schools tended to reflect the racial/ethnic composition of the immediate neighborhood. Secondary schools, which serve students from a number of elementary schools and therefore do not generally reflect the racial composition of small neighborhoods, were less segregated.

The indices showed different patterns of segregation. The changes in two indices—E(H,M,50%) and R(H,W)—probably were a reflection of the decrease in white composition of the universe; the decrease in whites caused E(H,M,50%) to rise and R(H,W) to fall. Similarly, the increase in Hispanic composition was the most likely cause of the decrease in R(H,NH).

The changes in the other two indices appear to be related to other factors. The decrease in R(H,B) from 1968 to 1972 was probably a direct result of desegregation of blacks. The subsequernt increase from 1972 to 1976 is clear evidence of an adverse reaction to the desegregation. The large drop in D(H,T) from 1968 to 1972 also indicates some desegregation activities.

TABLE IV.2

Percentage of Hispanic Students in School Districts Having Selected Characteristics

Characteristic	1968	1972	1976
Percent Hispano			
Low (<10%)	13%	08%	07%
Medium (10-40%)	25	25	29
High (>40%)	62	67	64
Percent Black			
Low (<10%)	49	49	47
Medium (10-40%)	45	45	42
High (>40%)	06	06	04
Metropolitan Status*			
Central City of an SMSA	63	61	61
Suburb (other area in SMSA)	24	28	30
Non-SMSA	03	11	09
District Size			
Large (>15,000 students)	70	70	68
Medium (5,000-14,999 students)	22	23	24
Small (<5,000)	08	07	08
Compliance Status			
Court Ordered	4	19	19
Voluntary Plan	9	5	13

*Designations normally used for metropolitan status are: 1) central city of an SMSA, 2) other area within SMSA (suburbs), and 3) non-SMSA area.

TABLE IV.3

Summary of National Trends in Segregation of Hispanic Students:

Values of Indices of Segregation

School level/Index of segregation	1968	1972	1976
All schools			
E(H,M,50%)	.605	.629	.687
R(H,NH)	.251	.217	.206
R(H,W)	.281	.239	.214
R(H,B)	.185	.171	.186
D(H,T)	.334	.293	.265
Elementary schools			
E(H,M,50%)	.647	.671	.743
R(H,NH)	.290	.249	.246
R(H,W)	.313	.256	.238
R(H,B)	.228	.219	.232
D(H,T)	.353	.304	.285
Secondaryschools			
E(H,M,50%)	.531	.565	.646
R(H,NH)	.184	.164	.159
R(H,W)	.219	.204	.188
R(H,B)	.145	.119	.139
D(H,T)	.294	.268	.237

Isolation of Hispanos (Tables IV.4 and IV.5)

Isolation of Hispanos, as measured by E(H,M,50%), increased between 1968 and 1976, with the increase between 1972 and 1976 exceeding the increase over the preceding 4 years. The increases probably were a direct result of decreases in white (i.e., nonminority) composition. When the proportion of whites in a district drops below 50%, isolation must increase,

TABLE IV.4.

Isolation of Hispanic Students Nationwide Based on E(H.M.50%)

National Hispanic enrollment	Period surveyed	
	1968-72	1972-76
Increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools		
All schools	259,235	301,911
Elementary schools	129,452	168,290
Secondary schools	116,662	164,864
Proportion of overall increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools*		
All schools	73	100% (107.30%)
Elementary schools	81	100% (141.58%)
Secondary schools	66	100% (100.92%)

*Increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools divided by total increase in Hispanic enrollment (from Table IV.1)

Note: The Hispanic enrollment in predominatly minority schools is computed by multiplying the isolation index by the total Hispanic enrollment. The percentages above 100% indicate that isolation is outstripping enrollment groweth.

especially if the district is trying to distribute all racial/ethnic groups throughout its schools. Since the percentage of whites in 1976 decreased to 51% in all schools, 47% in elementary schools, and 54% in secondary schools, the increase in isolation of Hispanos is not surprising. Examination of the matched sample shows only 29 of 247 districts with a net decrease in isolation for the 8-year period; 21% of the sample showed no change for the period, and the majority (63%) showed increased isolation.

TABLE IV.5

Hispanic Enrollment by Level of Segregation Based on E(H.M.50%)
(in millions)

School Type by District Level of Segregation	1968		1972		1976	
All schools	1.518		1.873		2.154	
Low	.245	(16%)	.316	(17%)	.265	(12%)
Medium	.603	(40%)	.436	(23%)	.424	(20%)
High	.669	(44%)	1.121	(60%)	1.465	(68%)
Elementary schools	.952		1.111		1.230	
Low	.126	(13%)	.152	(14%)	.110	(9%)
Medium	.287	(30%)	.216	(19%)	.232	(19%)
High	.538	(57%)	.743	(67%)	.887	(72%)
Secondary schools	.560		.733		.895	
Low	.161	(29%)	.182	(25%)	.164	(18%)
Medium	.156	(28%)	.213	(29%)	.157	(18%)
High	.243	(43%)	.338	(46%)	.576	(64%)

The increase in isolation also is shown by the number of students in isolated schools. Between 1968 and 1972, overall Hispanic enrollment increased by 259,000; 73% of the "new" Hispanic students were enrolled in isolated schools. Over the next 4 years, overall Hispanic enrollment increased by 330,000 while enrollment in predominantly minority schools increased by 335,000; the net increase in Hispanic students between 1972 and 1976 was entirely in isolated schools.

Enrollment of Hispanos shifted from moderately isolated to highly isolated districts. In 1968, 44% of all Hispanos were in districts having a high degree of isolation; this figure increased to 60% in 1972 and 68% in 1976. These increases were accompanied by a substantial decrease in enrollment in districts having a moderate degree of isolation and a somewhat smaller decrease in enrollment in districts having a low degree of isolation.

Segregation of Hispanic and Non-Hispanic students (Table IV.6)

Despite an increase in Hispanic enrollment and decrease in non-Hispanic enrollment, segregation between Hispanos and non-Hispanos decreased:* in 1968 only one-fourth of the maximum exposure of Hispanos to non-Hispanos remained to be achieved, and by 1976 this had dropped to one-fifth. However, the rate of decrease slowed dramatically, with approximately three-fourths of the net change occurring between 1968 and 1972. In the matched sample, 47% of the school districts showed an increase in segregation over the eight year period, 1968-72. Of the remaining districts, overall decreases in segregation were evident during these eight years, although some (30%) showed a slight increase in segregation from 1968 to 1972.

This decrease in segregation is shown in the distribution of Hispanic enrollment by level of segregation. The percentage of all Hispanic students in moderately segregated districts remained roughly constant, between 18 and 19, while the percentage enrolled in highly segregated districts dropped from 59% in 1968 to 50% in 1976. This drop was accompanied by a rise in the percentage enrolled in districts having low levels of segregation (23% in 1968 and 32% in 1976). Nonetheless, the number of Hispanos in highly segregated districts increased by 20% over the 8-year period.

*The isolation of Hispanos [E(H,M,50%)] measures the proportion of Hispanos in predominantly minority schools. It does not account for the racial composition of the district as a whole. The decrease of white enrollment in a district will generally cause the isolation index to increase. However, if the changes for the district are reflected in the school of the average Hispanic student, the segregation index for Hispanos [e.g., R(H,W)] will decrease. Consequently, it is possible to have increased isolation while simultaneously decreasing segregation for districts where the outflow of white students at the district level also strongly affects the ratio of Hispanos to whites in the average Hispanic school.

In secondary schools, the distribution of enrollment by level of segregation was radically different than in elementary schools. Relatively few students (fewer than 10%) were in districts having moderate levels of segregation; the vast majority were split almost equally between districts having high and low segregation. The changes in segregation were related to the inequality of this split: In 1968 a larger proportion of Hispanos were in districts having high levels of segregation, but in 1972 the reverse was true. This accounted for the decrease in the level of segregation between 1968 and 1972. In 1976 the proportions were nearly equal, with enrollment in districts having low levels of segregation slightly larger.

Despite the decrease in segregation, analyses of the matched sample suggests increases will occur in the near future. In the matched sample, 21% of districts (52 of 247) showed consistent and accelerating increases in segregation, and an additional 26% showed a decrease from 1968 to 1972, followed by a smaller increase over the next 4 years; hence, 47% of the matched sample showed an increased tendency to segregate Hispanos from other students. Of the remaining districts, 37% showed consistent and decelerating decreases, while 16% showed an increase from 1968 to 1972, followed by a larger decrease over the next 4 years.

TABLE IV.6

Hispanic Enrollment by Level of Segregation From Non-Hispanic Students--R(H,NH)

School level/ Segregation level	1968	1972	1976
All schools			
Low	341,977 (23%)	539,825 (29%)	683,250 (32%)
Medium	281,160 (19%)	354,726 (19%)	395,857 (18%)
High	895,338 (59%)	978,124 (52%)	1,074,932 (50%)
Elementary schools			
Low	170,437 (18%)	270,826 (24%)	311,667 (25%)
Medium	159,941 (17%)	155,963 (14%)	204,960 (17%)
High	621,460 (65%)	683,929 (62%)	712,958 (58%)
Secondary schools			
Low	241,004 (43%)	344,564 (47%)	409,011 (46%)
Medium	44,332 (8%)	63,305 (9%)	88,521 (10%)
High	274,410 (49%)	324,674 (44%)	398,367 (44%)

Segregation of Hispanic and White Students (Table IV.7)

Segregation of Hispanos from whites as measured by R(H,W) decreased, with the majority (63%) of the increase occurring between 1968 and 1972: in 1968, 28% of the maximum achievable exposure remained to be achieved, and by 1976 this figure had dropped to 21%. However, the matched sample showed a tendency toward resegregation: just over 40% of the districts in that sample showed increased segregation of Hispanos from whites.

The enrollment distribution by level of segregation showed the effect of decreased white enrollment. In 1968 the majority of Hispanos (60%) were in highly segregated school districts; this proportion decreased to 51% in 1972 and to 47% in 1976. The proportion of Hispanos enrolled in moderately segregated districts rose steadily, from 14% in 1968 to 20% in 1976. There was a similar rise in the proportion of Hispanos in districts having low levels of segregation (from 26% in 1968 to 24% in 1976).

TABLE IV.7

Hispanic Enrollment by Level of Segregation From White Students--R(H,W)

School level/ Segregation level	1968	1972	1976
All schools			
Low	388,743 (26%)	585,731 (31%)	725,711 (34%)
Medium	216,888 (14%)	333,260 (17%)	421,254 (20%)
High	912,844 (60%)	963,685 (51%)	1,007,074 (47%)
Elementary schools			
Low	211,614 (22%)	319,777 (29%)	374,734 (30%)
Medium	125,505 (13%)	133,998 (12%)	197,324 (16%)
High	614,719 (65%)	656,744 (59%)	657,527 (53%)
Secondary schools			
Low	254,519 (45%)	328,491 (45%)	408,837 (46%)
Medium	36,820 (7%)	79,465 (11%)	101,787 (11%)
High	268,407 (48%)	324,587 (44%)	385,275 (43%)

The distribution of Hispanos by level of segregation in secondary schools supports this conclusion. Small proportions of Hispanos were enrolled in districts having moderate levels of segregation, while the majority were split almost equally between districts having high and low levels of segregation—a pattern that does not indicate a steady pattern of desegregation.

Segregation of Hispanos and Blacks as measured by R(H,B) showed clear signs of resegregation. In 1968, 18.5% of the maximum exposure of Hispanos to blacks remained to be achieved; this figure dropped to 17.1% in 1972, then increased in 1976 to surpass 1968 levels. In addition, 25% of the matched sample showed no change or a definite increase in segregation. The distribution of Hispanic enrollment by level of segregation supports this conclusion. Between 1968 and 1972 there was a large shift from districts having low segregation to districts having moderate segregation. The shift

continued in 1976.

The distribution of Hispanic enrollment by level of segregation in secondary schools supports these trends. Between 1968 and 1972 there were small shifts from districts having low and high segregation in secondary schools to districts having moderately segregated secondary schools. In 1976, there was a large drop in the proportion of Hispanos in districts having low segregation in secondary schools accompanied by rises in the proportion of districts having moderately and highly segregated secondary schools.

TABLE IV.8

Hispanic Enrollment by Level of Segregation From Black Students--R(H,B)

School level/ Segregation level	1968	1972	1976
All schools			
Low	824,238 (54%)	653,260 (35%)	666,678 (31%)
Medium	242,785 (20%)	684,473 (37%)	844,802 (39%)
High	451,452 (30%)	534,942 (29%)	642,560 (30%)
Elementary schools			
Low	345,118 (36%)	349,235 (31%)	329,806 (27%)
Medium	255,405 (27%)	395,026 (36%)	471,652 (38%)
High	351,320 (37%)	366,458 (33%)	428,127 (35%)
Secondary schools			
Low	318,751 (57%)	404,076 (55%)	319,408 (36%)
Medium	102,567 (18%)	153,413 (21%)	331,726 (37%)
High	138,428 (25%)	175,054 (24%)	244,765 (27%)

Dissimilarity from Model Assignment Practice (Tables IV.9 and IV.10)

Segregation of Hispanos as measured by D(H,T) decreased: in 1968, 33.4% of all Hispanos in the universe required reassignment to meet the "model" assignment, but by 1976 this figure had decreased to 26.5%. Nonetheless, the majority of Hispanos (more than 60%) were enrolled in highly segregated districts.

The trend toward decreases in the Dissimilarity Index is supported by the matched sample. The majority of the sample (76%) showed steady decreases in the index, while only 6% showed steady increases. However, 18% showed a decrease from 1968 to 1972, followed by an increase over the next 4 years, which suggests that the trend exhibited over the period 1968 to 1976 may reverse in the future.

This conclusion is supported by changes in elementary schools. Between 1968 and 1972 Hispanic enrollment in elementary schools increased by 158,879 students (17%). Nearly all these students (98.7%) were assigned to schools in a manner consistent with assignment by size of the school. During the next 4 years Hispanic enrollment in elementary schools increased by an additional 11%. However, 7.6% of these new students were not assigned in a manner consistent with assignment by school size. The large increase in this proportion suggests that in the future additional Hispanic students in elementary schools will not be assigned on the basis of school size. Continuation of this trend would result in an increase in the Dissimilarity Index.

TABLE IV.9

Dissimilarity of Hispanic Student Assignment From Model Practice Nationwide Based on D(H,T)

School level	Period surveyed 1968-72	1972-76
Increase in number who would be reassigned		
All schools	41,523	35,078
Elementary schools	1,659	12,773
Secondary schools	28,094	19,669
Percentage of net increase in Hispanic enrollment that would be reassigned		
All schools	16.02%	10.46%
Elementary schools	1.28	7.59
Secondary schools	24.08	7.75

TABLE IV.10

Hispanic Enrollment (in millions) by Level of Segregation Based on D(H,T)

School Type by District Level of Segregation	1968		1972		1976	
All schools						
Low	.154	(10%)	.226	(12%)	.371	(17%)
Medium	.203	(13%)	.371	(19%)	.406	(19%)
High	1.161	(76%)	1.275	(68%)	1.377	(64%)
Elementary schools						
Low	.074	(8%)	.137	(12%)	.202	(17%)
Medium	.097	(10%)	.208	(19%)	.188	(5%)
High	.781	(82%)	.766	(69%)	.840	(68%)
Secondary schools						
Low	.124	(22%)	.168	(23%)	.224	(25%)
Medium	.068	(12%)	.101	(14%)	.179	(20%)
High	.369	(67%)	.464	(63%)	.493	(55%)

Regional Trends

Examination of regional trends in segregation of Hispanic students focused on four of the five regions defined for this study: East Coast, South, Midwest, and Southwest. The fifth region (Other) was not evaluated because districts in this region enrolled a small fraction of Hispanos in the univese (see Table IV.11).

This description begins with an overview of regional trends, then proceeds with a detailed discussion of behavior of the segregation indices in each region.

Table IV.12 shows the rank ordering of the regions, from highest to lowest value for each index, in 1968 and 1976. The rank of each district changes with each index. The average rank (computed by summing the ranks for each index and dividing by 5) shows the South to be the most segregated in both years and the Southwest to be the least segregated overall. The table also ranks the regions by the extent of improvement in the indices from 1968 to 1976. The average rank shows the South improving the most and the Southwest the least. The pattern of change in the indices is generally consistent with national patterns. The Isolation Index increased in all but the East Coast region, where an initial decrease was followed by an increase. The R Index for Hispanos and blacks decreased in 1972 and increased in 1976 except in the East and Midwest, where segregation increased. Segregation of Hispanos and non-Hispanos generally decreased except in the South, where there was an increase after 1972, and in the Midwest, where segregation increased. The Dissimilarity Index decreased in all regions.

East Coast

Enrollment in districts in the East Coast region is shown in Table IV.13; these districts accounted for an average of 21% of Hispanos, 36% of

blacks, and 16% of whites in the universe. The overwhelming majority of these students were enrolled in large, central city districts (see Table IV.14). However, the proportion of Hispanos in such districts declined over the 8-year period. New York City accounted for 82% of the region's Hispanic enrollment in 1968 and 67% in 1976.

TABLE IV.11

Percentage of Hispanos in the Nation's Public Schools Who Are in Sample I, by Region

Region	Year of study		
	1968	1972	1976
EAST COAST Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhose Island, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia	84.11%	85.25%	86.96%
SOUTH Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee	85.88	82.78	78.52
MIDWEST Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin	56.71	60.08	63.16
SOUTHWEST Arizona, California, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas	78.38	80.21	78.23
OTHER Alaska, Arkansas, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wyoming	20.02	23.49	28.49
Total	75.83	77.57	76.73

TABLE IV.12.

Regional Segregation and Change in Segregation of Hispanic Students*

Region	Average all indices 1968	1976	E(H,N,50%) 1968	1976	R(H,NH) 1968	1976	R(H,W) 1968	1976	R(H,B) 1968	1976	D(H,T) 1968	1976
East Coast	2.2	2.4	1	1	2	3	1	1	4	4	3	3
South	1.8	1.8	3	2	1	1	3	2	1	2	1	2
Midwest	3	2.4	4	4	3	2	4	4	2	1	2	1
Southwest	3	3.4	2	3	4	4	2	3	3	3	4	4

	Rank order by percentage decrease in value of segregation index between 1968 and 1976 (rank of 1 = largest decrease)					
East Coast	2.4	1	2	2	4	3
South	2.6	4	3	2	4	1
Midwest	3	3	4	1	3	4
Southwest	2	2	1	3	2	2

*Rank order by value of segregation index (rank of 1=highest value, most segregation)

TABLE IV.13

Enrollment in the East Coast Region by Race

School level/ racial group	1968	1972	1976
All schools			
Hispano	296,673	406,194	471,007
Black	485,657	665,153	910,205
White	686,966	842,770	853,127
All students	1,487,739	1,937,430	2,271,088
Elementary schools			
Hispano	198,060	252,394	271,366
Black	312,252	388,368	480,978
White	382,911	436,293	429,233
All students	883,969	1,091,680	1,203,857
Secondary schools			
Hispano	97,615	149,368	188,758
Black	169,781	280,944	414,545
White	322,402	394,497	403,469
All students	597,478	815,690	1,026,537

Isolation of Hispanic students (Table IV.15) On the East Coast, the proportion of Hispanos enrolled in predominantly minority schools declined from 1968 to 1972 and rose slightly from 1972 to 1976. The proportion in isolated elementary schools decreased gradually over the 8-year period. In secondary schools, however, the proportion decreased slightly, then increased from 1972 to 1976 to a level that exceeded the 1968 figure.

The number of Hispanos in isolated schools increased over the 8-year period. The rate of increase dropped substantially for elementary schools and remained nearly constant for secondary schools. The increase in enrollment in isolated schools did not parallel the general increase in Hispanic enrollment. In elementary schools, smaller fractions of the new Hispanic students were enrolled in isolated schools between 1968 and 1972 than between 1972 and 1976. Secondary schools showed a marked increase in the proportion of new Hispanic students in isolated schools, from 73% between 1968 and 1972 to 96% between 1974 and 1976.

Table IV.16 Segregation of Hispanos and non-Hispanos decreased over the 8-year period. In 1968, 28.7% of the maximum exposure to non-Hispanos decreased over the 8-year period: in 1968, 28.7% of the maximum exposure

TABLE IV.14

Percentage of Hispanic Students in Large and Central City School Districts in the East Coast Region

School level/Type of district	1968	1972	1976
All schools			
Large districts*	93.04%	89.40%	86.30%
Central city districts	93.64	90.72	89.04
Elementary schools			
Large districts*	92.45	88.19	82.90
Central city districts	93.23	90.24	88.45
Secondary schools			
Large districts*	94.30	91.78	87.02
Central city districts	94.42	91.96	91.01

*Large districts are defined here as those with greater than 15,000 students.

TABLE IV.15

Isolation of Hispanic Students in the East Coast Region Based on E(H,M,50%)

Indicator/School level	Year of survey 1968	1972	1976
Values of the isolation index*			
All schools	.833	.822	.825
Elementary schools	.851	.849	.845
Secondary schools	.796	.774	.813
	Period surveyed 1968-72		1972-76
Increase in Hispoanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools			
All schools	86,762		54,690
Elementary schools	45,903		14,852
Secondary schools	37,909		37,849
Proportion of overall increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools**			
All schools	79%		84%
Elementary schools	84		79
Secondary schools	73		96

*The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.

**Increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools divided by total increase in Hispanic enrollment (from Table IV.13).

to non-Hispanos remained to be achieved, but by 1976 this figure had decreased to 23.4%. However, the rate of decrease slowed gradually. Segregation in elementary schools was somewhat higher than in all schools, but a decrease was evident: in 1968, 31.1% of the maximum feasible exposure to non-Hispanos in elementary schools remained to be achieved, but by 1976 this figure had decreased to 27.1%, with the majority of the decrease occurring between 1968 and 1972. Secondary schools showed somewhat less segregation but exhibited the same decrease in segregation: in 1968, 22.9% of the maximum feasible exposure to non-Hispanos remained to be achieved, but over the next 8 years this figure decreased at a fairly constant rate to 18.6%.

Segregation of Hispanic and white students (Table IV.16) Segregation of Hispanos and whites in the East Coast decreased over the 8-year period. In 1968, 50.9% of the maximum feasible exposure of Hispanos to whites remained to be achieved, but by 1976 this figure had decreased to 36.9%. The rate of decrease was relatively constant. Elementary schools exhibited a somewhat higher segregation of Hispanos and whites (52.7% in 1968) but the same magnitude of decrease as for all schools (to 38.6% in 1976), with the majority of the decrease (57%) occurring between 1968 and 1972. Secondary

Table IV.16

Values of R Indices of Segregation of Hispanos From Other Students in the East Coast Region

Index/School level	1968	1972	1976
Segregation of Hispanos and non-Hispanos—R(N,NH)			
All schools	.287	.253	.234
Elementary schools	.311	.277	.271
Secondary schools	.229	.205	.186
Segregation of Hispanos and whites—R(H,W)			
All schools	.509	.438	.369
Elementary schools	.527	.446	.386
Secondary schools	.459	.420	.355
Segregation of Hispanos and blacks—R(H,B)			
All schools	.012	.072	.123
Elementary schools	.071	.130	.178
Secondary schools	.008	.014	.050

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.

schools showed somewhat lower levels of segregation of Hispanos and whites and a slightly smaller decrease in segregation: in 1968, 45.9% of the maximum feasible exposure remained to be achieved, and in 1976 this figure was 35.5%. In secondary schools the rate of decrease accelerated; the period between 1972 and 1976 accounted for most of the change.

Segregation of Hispanic and black students (Table IV.16) Segregation of Hispanos and blacks in the East Coast was quite low. In 1968, only 1.2% of the maximum feasible exposure of Hispanos and blacks remained to be achieved, but by 1976 this measure had jumped, in two nearly equal steps, to 12.3%. Elementary schools exhibited somewhat higher levels of segregation of Hispanos from blacks than did all schools, but the increase was comparable: in 1968, 7.1% of the maximum feasible exposure to blacks remained to be achieved, and by 1976 this figure had increased to 17.8% with the majority (55%) of the increase occurring between 1968 and 1972. Secondary schools exhibited very low levels of segregation but did show an increase between 1968 and 1976: In 1968 Hispanos and blacks were very nearly desegregated, with only 0.8% of the exposure to achieve, but by 1976, this figure increased to 5.0%. The rate of increase rose sharply, 86% of the increase coming between 1972 and 1976.

Dissimilarity from model assignment practice (Table IV.17) The proportion of Hispanic students in the East Coast requiring reassignment to meet the model assignment practice decreased over the period studied. In 1968, 42.2% of Hispanos would have required reassignment, but by 1976 this figure had dropped to 33.8%. The rate of decrease fell, with nearly two-thirds of the total decrease occurring between 1968 and 1972. The number of Hispanic

students requiring reassignment to meet the model increased since 1968, with most of the increase occurring between 1968 and 1972. However, the percentage of new students who would be reassigned dropped. Elementary and secondary schools showed the same pattern of decreasing segregation as all schools. However, in 1968, elementary schools showed a lower level of dissimilarity than did all schools, while secondary schools showed a higher level. This difference resumed the normal pattern—higher segregation in elementary schools and lower in secondary schools—by 1972.

South

Southern states enrolled between 3 and 4% of Hispanic students in the universe. The majority were in large suburban districts; in fact, more than 90% were enrolled in two large districts in Florida (Hillsborough and Dade counties). Consequently, segregation of Hispanos in the South was largely dependent on segregation in these two districts. Tables IV.18 and IV.19 show summary enrollment and distribution of Hispanos in the South.

TABLE IV.17

Dissimilarity of Hispanic Student Assignment From Model Practice in the East Coast Region Based on D(H,T)

Indicator/School level	Year of survey 1968	1972	1976
Values of the Dissimilarity Index*			
All schools	.422	.368	.338
Elementary schools	.414	.369	.352
Secondary schools	.424	.354	.314
	Period surveyed 1968-72		1972-76
Increase in number who would be reassigned			
All schools	24,283		9,721
Elementary schools	11,210		2,314
Secondary schools	11,487		6,394
Percentage of net increase in Hispanic enrollment that could be reassigned			
All schools	22.2%		15.0%
Elementary schools	20.6		12.3
Secondary schools	22.2		16.2

*The higher the value of the index, the greater the divergence from the model assignment practice.

TABLE IV.18

Enrollment in the South, by Race/Ethnicity

School level/Racial/ethnic group	1968	1972	1976
All Schools			
Hispano	47,740	70,103	84,812
Black	77,704	87,737	112,579
White	223,278	218,214	243,446
All students	390,060	377,715	442,963
Elementary schools			
Hispano	26,847	37,648	42,341
Black	46,073	46,230	62,075
White	113,963	100,779	118,698
All students	187,488	185,349	224,201
Secondary schools			
Hispano	20,734	29,265	42,471
Black	31,493	39,398	50,504
White	106,331	106,884	124,748
All students	159,219	178,454	218,762

TABLE IV.19

Percentage of Hispanic Students in Large and Suburban Districts in the South

School level/Type of district	1968	1972	1976
All schools			
Large districts	97	95	95
Suburban districts	83	86	89
Elementary schools			
Large districts	97	95	97
Suburban districts	85	86	91
Secondary schools			
Large districts	97	95	97
Suburban districts	80	84	92

TABLE IV.20

Isolation of Hispanic Students in the South Based on E(H,M,50%)

Indicator/School level	Year of survey 1968	1972	1976
Values of the isolation index*			
All schools	.542	.608	.710
Elementary schools	.589	.646	.734
Secondary schools	.485	.566	.720
	Period surveyed 1968-72		1972-76
Increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools			
All schools	16,748		17,594
Elementary schools	8,508		6,757
Secondary schools	6,510		14,013
Proportion of overall increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools**			
All schools	75%		(120%)
Elementary schools	79%		(144%)
Secondary schools	76%		(144%)

*The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.
**Increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools divided by total increase in Hispanic enrollment (from Table IV.13).

TABLE IV.21

Values of R Indices of Segregation of Hispanos From Other Students in the South

Index/School level	1968	1972	1976
Segregation of Hispanos and non-Hispanos—R(H,NH)			
All schools	.344	.269	.290
Elementary schools	.374	.296	.324
Secondary schools	.282	.227	.270
Segregation of Hispanos and Whites—R(H,W)			
All schools	.198	.250	.245
Elementary schools	.201	.228	.237
Secondary schools	.183	.245	.264
Segregation of Hispanos and blacks—R(H,B)			
All schools	.687	.308	.360
Elementary schools	.751	.404	.441
Secondary schools	.598	.193	.279

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.

Dissimilarity from model assignment practice (Table IV.22) In 1968, 49.3% of all Hispanic students required reassignment to meet the model assignment practice; by 1976 this had decreased to 35.6%, with the majority of the decrease (88%) coming between 1968 and 1972. The number of students requiring reassignment increased over the 8-year period due to an increase in Hispanic enrollment as well as an increase in dissimilarity. During the period of greatest Hispanic enrollment increase (1968-1972) only 11% of the net increase in enrollment was assigned to schools in a manner inconsistent with the model, but over the next 4 years this figure increased to 28%.

TABLE IV.22

Dissimilarity of Hispanic Student Assignment From Model Practice In the South Based on D(H,T)

Indicator/School level	Year of survey 1968	1972	1976
Values of the Dissimilarity Index *			
All schools	.493	.372	.356
Elementary schools	.519	.370	.391
Secondary schools	.451	.358	.337
	Period surveyed 1968-72		1972-76
Increase in number who would be reassigned			
All schools	2542		4095
Elementary schools	-4		2625
Secondary schools	1127		3835
Percentage of net increase in Hispanic enrollment that could be reassigned			
All schools	11%		28%
Elementary schools	<0		56
Secondary schools	13		29

* The higher the value of the index, the greater the divergence from the model assignment practice.

Elementary schools showed a decline in segregation measured by the Dissimilarity Index, followed by an increase. However, there was still a net reduction in the level of segregation. Between 1968 and 1972 the net increase in Hispanic enrollment was assigned to schools in a manner consistent with the model, but during the next 4-year period more than half of the increased Hispanic enrollment was not assigned to schools in such a manner.

Secondary schools showed a consistent decrease in the Dissimilarity Index, but the rate of decrease slowed with 82% of the decrease occurring between 1968 and 1972. Over the first 4 years only 13% of the net increase in Hispanic enrollment was assigned to schools in a manner inconsistent with the model, but during the next 4 years this figure rose to 29%.

Midwest

School districts in the Midwest enrolled between 7 and 8% of all Hispanos in the universe. The majority were in large central city districts, but there was a slight shift toward large suburban districts. The two large cities in this region having substantial Hispanic population (Chicago and Denver) enrolled slightly more than half the Hispanic students in the region. Tables IV.23 and IV.24 show enrollment statistics for the Midwest.

TABLE IV.23
Enrollment in the Midwest, by Race

School level/Racial/ethnic group	1968	1972	1976
All schools			
Hispano	116,766	147,084	171,833
Black	382,407	419,784	418,740
White	565,293	620,223	546,122
All students	1,072,067	1,197,247	1,151,931
Elementary schools			
Hispano	80,104	92,315	104,307
Black	263,194	274,532	252,354
White	347,196	340,705	275,359
All students	695,478	713,713	641,410
Secondary schools			
Hispano	36,077	49,267	58,472
Black	115,005	135,289	140,137
White	211,723	254,526	258,385
All students	365,294	442,732	462,241

Isolation of Hispanic students (Table IV.25) Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools increased over the 8-year period: in 1968, 50% of all Hispanic students were in isolated schools, but by 1976 this figure had risen to 57.6%, with the majority of the increase (81%) occurring between 1972 and 1976. The number of Hispanos in isolated schools increased, with most of the increase coming between 1972 and 1976. This is best shown by the proportion of the net Hispanic enrollment increase that was in isolated schools: between 1968 and 1972 slightly more than half (56%) of new Hispanic students attended isolated schools, but during the next 4-year period nearly all (97.7%) of the new Hispanic students attended such schools.

Elementary schools in the Midwest showed the same pattern. In 1968, 54.9% of all Hispanic elementary students attended isolated schools. By 1976 this figure had increased to 63.6%. As with all schools, the rate of increase accelerated: between 1968 and 1972, 71% of the net increase in Hispanic elementary students were enrolled in isolated schools, while between 1972 and 1976 the entire increase in enrollment (and then some) attended such schools.

TABLE IV.24

Percentage of Hispanic Students in Large and Central City Districts in the Midwest

School level/Type of district	1968	1972	1976
All schools			
Large districts	78	78	75
Central city districts	79	77	75
Elementary schools			
Large districts	80	81	75
Central city districts	81	80	73
Secondary schools			
Large districts	75	75	64
Central city districts	76	74	63

TABLE IV.25

Isolation of Hispanic Students in the Midwest Based on E(H.M.50%)

Indicator/School level	Year of survey 1968	1972	1976
Values of the isolation index *			
All schools	.501	.514	.576
Elementary schools	.549	.570	.636
Secondary schools	.393	.414	.394
	Period surveyed 1968-72		1972-76
Increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools			
All schools	17,101		21,592
Elementary schools	8,643		13,717
Secondary schools	5,219		2,642
Percentage of overall increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools **			
All schools	56%		99.7%
Elementary schools	71		>100 (114%)
Secondary schools	40		29

*The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.
**Increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools divided by total increase in Hispanic enrollment (from Table IV.13).

Secondary schools in the Midwest showed radically different patterns of isolation. The percentage of students in isolated secondary schools increased from 39.3% in 1968 to 41.4% in 1972, then dropped to 39.4% in 1976. This decreased tendency to assign Hispanic students to isolated secondary schools is best shown by examining enrollment increases. Between 1968 and 1972, 40% of the net increase in Hispanic secondary school enrollment (or 5,219 students) attended isolated schools. With the decline in the index, this figure was only 29% in 1976.

Segregation of Hispanic and non-Hispanic students (Table IV.26)

Segregation between Hispanos and non-Hispanos in the Midwest increased over the study period. In 1968, 26.4% of the maximum exposure of Hispanos to non-Hispanos remained to be achieved, and by 1976 this figure was 28.3%, with most of the increase (79%) occurring between 1972 and 1976. Segregation in elementary schools also increased; however, the majority of the increase (54%) occurred between 1968 and 1972. Secondary schools showed an increase over the first 4 years, then a decrease to a level of segregation lower than that in 1968.

There was little segregation between Hispanos and whites in the Midwest; furthermore, segregation decreased at accelerating rates over the 8-year period. In 1968, 11% of the maximum feasible exposure of Hispanos to whites remained to be achieved, but by 1976 this figure had dropped to 5.2% with the majority of the decrease (72%) coming over the latter 4 years. Both the elementary and secondary schools, exhibited similar patterns of decreased segregation.

The Midwest showed increasing and accelerating segregation of Hispanos and blacks. In 1968, 38.4% of the maximum feasible exposure of Hispanos and

TABLE IV.26

Values of R Indices of Segregation of Hispanic From Other Students in the Midwest

Index/School level	1968	1972	1976
Segregation of Hispanos and non-Hispanos--R(H,NH)			
All schools	.264	.268	.283
Elementary schools	.314	.327	.338
Secondary schools	.153	.169	.141
Segregation of Hispanos and Whites--R(H,W)			
All schools	.110	.094	.052
Elementary schools	.123	.097	.057
Secondary schools	.079	.077	.040
Segregation of Hispanos and blacks--R(H,B)			
All schools	.384	.391	.425
Elementary schools	.463	.496	.510
Secondary schools	.216	.235	.246

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.

blacks remained to be achieved, but by 1976 this figure had risen to 42.5%, with the majority of the increase (83%) occurring between 1972 and 1976. Elementary and secondary schools showed similar increases in segregation, but with slowing rates; most of the increases occurred between 1968 and 1972.

Dissimilarity from model assignment practice (Table IV.27) The proportion of students requiring reassignment to meet the model assignment practice decreased in the Midwest. In 1968, 48% of all Hispanos would be reassigned; by 1976 this figure dropped, in two nearly equal steps, to 42%. The decline in segregation is shown in the proportion of new students who would be reassigned by the model: between 1968 and 1972, 32% of all new Hispanic students would have been reassigned, but over the next 4 years, this figure decreased to 24%. Both elementary and secondary schools showed the same pattern.

Southwest

The Southwestern states enrolled the vast majority of Hispanic students in the universe—69% in 1968 and 65% in 1976. Most of these students were in large districts, and slightly more than half were in central city districts. However, a substantial fraction (between 28% and 32%) attended schools in medium-sized or suburban districts. Between 20% and 22% were enrolled in five of the largest ten districts in the nation. Hence, Hispanic enrollment in the Southwest was more dispersed than in any other region. Tables IV.28 and IV.29 show enrollment statistics for the Southwest.

Isolation of Hispanic students (Table IV.30) In 1968 the Southwest had the second highest proportion of Hispanos in predominantly minority schools. By 1976, although a higher proportion were such schools, the Southwest has the second lowest proportion of the four regions.

In 1968, 55.9% of all Hispanos in the Southwest attended predominantly minority schools; over the next 8 years this figure increased to 65.9%. The rate of increase accelerated, with 72% of the net change in the index occurring between 1972 and 1976. Between 1968 and 1972 only 74% of the net increase in Hispanic enrollment was in predominantly minority schools; however, over the next 4 years the entire increase in Hispanos was in such schools.

Both elementary and secondary schools showed the same general trend. Elementary schools showed higher proportions of Hispanos in isolated schools and a greater increase: 60.3% in 1968, but 72.8% in 1976, with the majority of the increase in isolated enrollment in elementary schools between 1972 and 1976 exceeded the net increase in Hispanic enrollment. Secondary schools showed somewhat lower proportions of Hispanos in predominantly minority schools, and the increase in the proportion was greater than for elementary schools or all schools. In 1968, 48.7% of all Hispanic secondary students were in such schools; by 1976 this figure had increased to 61.6%, with the majority of the increases (70.5%) coming between 1972 and 1976. Between 1972 and 1976 the net increase in Hispanic enrollment was in isolated schools.

Segregation of Hispanic and non-Hispanic students (Table IV.31) In 1968, 23.7% of the maximum feasible exposure of Hispanos to non-Hispanos remained to be achieved; by 1976 this figure had decreased to 18.6%, with

TABLE IV.27

Dissimilarity of Hispanic Student Assignment From Model Practice in the Midwest Based on D(H,T)

Indicator/School level	Year of survey 1968	1972	1976
Values of the Dissimilarity Index*			
All schools	.480	.447	.420
Elementary schools	.526	.507	.468
Secondary schools	.375	.348	.288
	Period surveyed 1968-72		1972-76
Increase in number who would be reassigned			
All schools	9,690		5,123
Elementary schools	4,669		2,012
Secondary schools	3,616		-305
Percentage of net increase in Hispanic enrollment that could be reassigned			
All schools	32		24
Elementary schools	38		17
Secondary schools	27		20

*The higher the value of the index, the greater the divergence from the model assignment practice.

TABLE IV.28

Enrollment in the Southwest, by Race/Ethnicity

School level/Racial/ethnic group	1968	1972	1976
All schools			
Hispanic	1,045,244	1,232,468	1,445,693
Black	588,632	673,371	716,037
White	3,390,172	3,336,475	3,034,285
All students	5,141,922	5,377,495	5,380,604
Elementary schools			
Hispanic	639,058	717,831	796,025
Black	366,912	370,601	374,265
White	1,853,703	1,673,311	1,458,325
All students	2,929,031	2,834,381	2,749,314
Secondary schools			
Hispanic	401,072	498,210	595,070
Black	220,031	290,396	331,554
White	1,525,452	1,627,951	1,543,315
All students	2,194,733	2,477,461	2,375,930

TABLE IV.29

Percentage of Hispanic Students in Large and Medium-sized, Central City and Suburban Districts in the Southwest

School level/Type of district	1968	1972	1976
All schools			
Large districts	62	61	60
Medium districts	28	30	30
Central city districts	55	52	54
Suburban districts	28	32	32
Elementary schools			
Large districts	62	60	60
Medium districts	28	30	30
Central city districts	55	52	59
Suburban districts	30	33	32

the majority of the drop (76.5%) coming between 1968 and 1972. Elementary schools showed a higher level of segregation and a somewhat larger decrease in segregation than did all schools. Secondary schools showed a lower level of segregation and a smaller decrease. Most of the decrease in segregation for both elementary schools and secondary schools occurred between 1968 and 1972. Despite these decreases, half the Southwestern districts in the matched sample showed the effects of resegregation.

In 1968, 24% of the maximum feasible exposure of Hispanos to whites remained to be achieved; by 1972 this figure had dropped to 18.2%, with the majority of the drop (81%) occurring between 1968 and 1972. Elementary schools showed a higher level of segregation than did all schools; however, in elementary schools the entire decrease in segregation occurred between 1968 and 1972. Secondary schools showed a somewhat lower level of segregation and a smaller decrease in segregation than did all schools, with most of the change (84%) occurring between 1968 and 1972. However, nearly half (42%) of Southwestern districts in the matched sample show any increase in segregation.

In 1968, 19.1% of the maximum feasible exposure between Hispanos and blacks remained to be achieved; by 1976 this figure had decreased to 17%,

TABLE IV.30.

Isolation of Hispanic Students in the Southwest Based on E(H,W,50%)

Indicator/School level	Year of survey 1968	1972	1976
Values of the isolation index*			
All schools	.539	.587	.639
Elementary schools	.603	.628	.728
Secondary schools	.487	.524	.616
	Period surveyed 1968-72		1972-76
Increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minorityschools			
All schools	139,168		229,253
Elementary schools	65,446		128,708
Secondary schools	65,740		105,301
Proportion of overall increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools**			
All schools	74		>100 (108)
Elementary schools	83		>100 (105)
Secondary schools	68		>100 (109)

*The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.
**Increase in Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools divided by total increase in Hispanic enrollment (from Table IV.13).

with the overwhelming majority of the change (95%) coming between 1968 and 1972. Hence, the rate of desegregation slowed dramatically. Elementary schools showed a higher level of segregation and a nearly equal decrease in segregation compared with all schools. In 1968, 22.7% of the maximum feasible exposure of Hispanos to blacks remained to be achieved, and by 1976 this figure had decreased to 20.5% with most of the change (91%) occurring between 1968 and 1972.

Secondary schools showed a different pattern of segregation than did the other two groups of schools. Segregation between Hispanos and blacks decreased then increased. Nonetheless, there was a small net reduction in segregation between Hispanos and Blacks: In 1968, 15% of the maximum feasible exposure between Hispanos and blacks remained to be achieved; figures for 1972 and 1976 were 13.5 and 14.7%. Hence, the likelihood to segregate Hispanos from blacks in secondary schools increased.

Dissimilarity from model assignment practices (Table IV.32) In 1968, 28.5% of all Hispanos would have been reassigned if the model assignment practice had been followed; by 1976 this figure had decreased to 21.8%, with the majority of the decrease (60%) coming between 1968 and 1972. Both the number and proportion of new students for reassignment increased.

Elementary schools showed a somewhat greater dissimilarity and slightly better improvement than did all schools. In 1968, 30.4% of Hispanic elementary school students would have been reassigned by the model; by 1976 this figure had decreased to 23.2%, with the majority of the decrease (72%) occurring between 1968 and 1972. The number of students for reassignment at first decreased, then increased over the next 4 years.

Secondary schools also showed a decrease in the Dissimilarity Index. In 1968, 24.8% of secondary school students would have been reassigned by the model; by 1976 this figure had decreased to 20%, with the slight majority of the increase (54%) occurring between 1968 and 1972.

TABLE IV.31

Values of 9 Indices of Segregation of Hispanic From Other Students in the Midwest

Index/School level	1968	1972	1976
Segregation of Hispanos and non-Hispanos--R(H,NH)			
All schools	.237	.198	.186
Elementary schools	.278	.228	.223
Secondary schools	.172	.149	.146
Segregation of Hispanos and Whites--R(H,W)			
All schools	.240	.193	.182
Elementary schools	.277	.213	.213
Secondary schools	.177	.151	.146
Segregation of Hispanos and blacks--R(H,B)			
All schools	.191	.121	.170
Elementary schools	.227	.207	.205
Secondary schools	.150	.135	.147

Note: The higher the valueof the index, the greater the segregation.

TABLE IV.32.

Dissimilarity of Hispanic Student Assignment From Model Practice in the Southwest Based on D(H,T)

Indicator/School level	Year of survey 1968	1972	1976
Values of the Dissimilarity Index*			
All schools	.285	.245	.218
Elementary schools	.304	.292	.232
Secondary schools	.248	.222	.200
	Period surveyed 1968-72		1972-76
Increase in number who would be reassigned			
All schools	4,060		13,206
Elementary schools	-13,381		3,785
Secondary schools	11,137		8,411
Percentage of net increase in Hispanic enrollment that could be reassigned			
All schools	2		6
Elementary schools	<0		5
Secondary schools	11		9

*The higher the value of the index, the greater the divergence from the model assignment practice

Trends in Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollment

Overall Trends

The ten districts having the largest number of Hispanic students (sample II) had a significant impact on regional and national measures of Hispanic segregation. Collectively, these districts enrolled between 36% (1976) and 38% (1968) of all Hispanos in the universe. In all but the Southwest region these districts enrolled more than half of the Hispanos in the universe for that region. Hence, segregation trends in these ten districts can significantly alter regional and national trends.

In this section the indices of segregation of Hispanos in these ten districts are reported and the similarities and diffterences in trends between the cities are discussed. A brief discussion of each district also presents some of the desegregation history.

The racial/ethnic composition of the ten districts having the largest Hispanic enrollment changed over the period studied. Table IV.33 shows the average (per district) enrollment statistics for these districts. In general, there was an increased Hispanic and black presence accompanied by a decreased presence of whites. However, the patterns of change were not consistent for all districts: Hillsborough County showed decreased Hispanic enrollment and increased black and white enrollment, and Los Angeles, Denver, and Chicago showed decreased black enrollment after 1972.

TABLE IV.33

Average Enrollment in Each of the Ten Districts Having the Largest Hispanic Enrollment (Sample II)

School level/Racial ethnic group	1968	1972	1976
All schools			
Hispano	57,461	69,638	79,558
Black	102,833	114,494	114,550
White	168,624	143,265	114,302
All students	334,424	333,155	317,838
Elementary schools			
Hispano	36,674	41,939	45,942
Black	65,803	67,777	62,549
White	91,640	73,752	46,879
All students	195,000	186,536	170,470
Secondary schools			
Hispano	20,580	26,889	32,220
Black	36,539	45,195	48,036
White	75,809	67,872	55,392
All students	135,218	142,599	139,822

Isolation of Hispanic students Table IV.34 shows values of the isolation index for the ten cities selected for Sample II. The proportion of all Hispanos in these districts in predominantly minority schools increases from 73% in 1968 to 83% in 1976; with the majority of the increase coming between 1972 and 1976. However, this trend was not exhibited in all districts: Hillsborough and Albuquerque show a net decrease in the proportion of Hispanos in predominatly minority schools.

TABLE IV.34

Isolation of Hispanic Students in Predominantly Minority Schools in School Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollment (Sample II): Values of E(H,M,50%)

District	1968	1972	1976
Los Angeles Unified	0.67	0.74	0.85
San Diego City Unified	0.35	0.37	0.49
Denver	0.52	0.59	0.75
Dade	0.61	0.68	0.80
Hillsborough	0.22	0.13	0.16
Chicago	0.62	0.71	0.81
Albuquerque	0.72	0.72	0.68
New York City	0.88	0.88	0.90
Dallas Independent School District	0.55	0.57	0.68
Houston Independent School District	0.64	0.71	0.81
Average for Sample II*	0.58	0.61	0.69
Weighted Average for Sample II**	0.73	0.77	0.83

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the proportion of Hispanic students in predominantly minority schools.
*Average per district proportion of Hispanic students in predominantly minority schools.
**Overall proportion of Hispanics in predominantly minority schools for sample II districts.

Segregation of Hispanic and non-Hispanic students Segregation of Hispanos from non-Hispanos remained relatively constant over the 8-year period. Table IV.35 shows values of the index of segregation for Sample II districts. The line labelled "Average for Sample II" shows segregation for the average district. The next line labelled "Weighted Average for Sample II" shows segregation for the average Hispanic student in these districts. Each average shows the same value for 1968 and 1976 with a slight dip in 1972. Hence, segregation of Hispanos from non-Hispanos has not changed when these districts are considered as a whole.

Two districts, San Diego and Chicago, showed significant net increases in segregation, and in both the rate of increase accelerated. Los Angeles also showed a net increase in segregation, but the increase between 1968 and 1972 was slight and there was no change over the next 4 years. The remaining seven districts showed a net decrease in segregation. In four, the decrease occurred between 1968 and 1972, followed by an increase. Two districts, New York and Albuquerque, showed a consistent decrease in segregation, but at a decreasing rate. Only Denver showed an increase from 1968 to 1972 and then a significant decrease.

Segregation of Hispanic and white students Table IV.36 shows values of the segregation index for Hispanos and Whites in the ten largest districts. On the average, segregation declined over the period studied at a fairly steady rate. In 1968, 40% of the maximum feasible exposure of Hispanos to whites remained to be achieved; by 1976 this figure had decreased to 36%. Segregation increased in Los Angeles, San Diego, Dade

TABLE IV.35

Segregation of Hispanic From Non-Hispanic Students in School Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollment (Sample II): Values of R(H,NH)

District	1968	1972	1976
Los Angeles Unified	0.44	0.45	0.45
San Diego City Unified	0.11	0.13	0.17
Denver	0.28	0.31	0.21
Dade	0.38	0.30	0.33
Hillsborough	0.13	0.09	0.10
Chicago City	0.38	0.43	0.50
Albuquerque	0.29	0.27	0.26
New York City	0.32	0.29	0.28
Dallas Independent School District	0.28	0.26	0.27
Houston Independent School District	0.43	0.35	0.42
Average for Sample II*	0.30	0.29	0.30
Weighted Average for Sample II**	0.35	0.33	0.35

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.
*Segregation in the average district.
**Segregation of the average Hispanic student in sample II districts.

County, and Hillsborough County. Houston, New York, and Albuquerque showed moderate decreases, while Dallas and Denver showed substantial decreases. In Chicago there was no perceptible segregation of Hispanos and whites during the entire period.

TABLE IV.36

Segregation of Hispanic from White Students in School Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollment (Sample II): Values of R(H,W)

District	1968	1972	1976
Los Angeles Unified	0.41	0.37	0.42
San Diego City Unified	0.24	0.24	0.30
Denver	0.30	0.31	0.08
Dade	0.22	0.27	0.26
Hillsborough	0.06	0.12	0.15
Chicago City	0.0	0.0	0.0
Albuquerque	0.33	0.31	0.30
New York City	0.57	0.54	0.49
Dallas Independent School District	0.22	0.10	0.0
Houston Independent School District	0.28	0.28	0.25
Average for sample II*	0.26	0.25	0.23
Weighted average for sample II**	0.40	0.38	0.36

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.
*Segregation in the average district.
**Segregation of the average Hispanic student in sample II districts.

Segregation of Hispanic and black students As Table IV.37 shows, in general segregation of Hispanos and blacks in the ten districts increase: while 32% of the maximum feasible exposure of Hispanos and blacks remained to be achieved in 1968, this figure was 37% in 1976. This general increase was not exhibited by all of the districts. However, Los Angeles, Hillsborough, and Houston showed a decrease in segregation, while San Diego and Albuquerque show no perceptible segregation.

TABLE IV.37

Segregation Of Hispanos From Black Students In School Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollment (Sample II): Values Of R(H,B)

District	1968	1972	1976
Los Angeles Unified	0.63	0.67	0.62
San Diego City Unified	0.0	0.0	0.0
Denver	0.24	0.34	0.54
Dade	0.76	0.36	0.42
Hillsborough	0.42	0.0	0.0
Chicago City	0.74	0.76	0.78
Albuquerque	0.0	0.0	0.0
New York City	0.0	0.06	0.12
Dallas Independent School District	0.43	0.49	0.51
Houston Independent School District	0.68	0.43	0.56
Average for sample II*	0.39	0.31	0.35
Weighted Average for Sample II**	0.32	0.31	0.37

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.
*Segregation in average district.
**Segregation of the average Hispanic student in sample II districts.

Dissimilarity from model assig[illegible]ractice Table IV.38 shows the values of the Dissimilarity Index fo[illegible] sample II. Both average values decreased steadily in the average index from 48% in 1968 to 40% or 41% in 1976. In fact, with the exception of San Diego and Hillsborough, all districts exhibit a decrease in the index. In San Diego, there is an increase between 1968 and 1972 with no change from 1972 to 1976. Hillsborough exhibits a decrease for 1968 to 1972 followed by a large increase from 1972 to 1976.

TABLE IV.38

Dissimilarity OF Hispanic Student Assignment From Model Practice In School Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollment (Sample II): Values of D(HT)

District	1968	1972	1976
Los Angeles Unified	0.49	0.47	0.42
San Diego City Unified	0.33	0.34	0.34
Denver	0.44	0.42	0.32
Dade	0.50	0.37	0.36
Hillsborough	0.46	0.38	0.48
Chicago City	0.66	0.65	0.64
Albuquerque	0.33	0.30	0.27
New York City	0.44	0.39	0.35
Dallas Independent School District	0.55	0.50	0.48
Houston Independent School District	0.58	0.49	0.48
Average for Sample II*	0.48	0.43	0.41
Weighted Average for Sample II**	0.48	0.43	0.40

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the divergence from model assignment practice.
*Average per district
**Average per Hispanic student.

District-by-District Trends

Los Angeles At the time of study, Los Angeles had the second largest Hispanic enrollment in the nation. The total enrollment declined from 1968 to 1972 due to a loss of white students and from 1972 to 1976 due to a loss of both blacks and whites. Meanwhile, the number of Hispanos enrolled in Los Angeles steadily increased. As a result, the percentage of Hispanos exceeded the percentage of blacks in 1976. (Data reported by the U.S. Commission of Civil Rights for 1977 showed Hispanos as the single largest racial group in Los Angeles.)

Although Los Angeles has been involved in litigation since 1963, there has been no appreciable desegregation of Hispanos. Increasing numbers and proportions of Hispanos were enrolled in predominately minority schools (85% in 1976). Between 44 and 45% of the maximum achievable exposure of Hispanos to non-Hispanos remained to be achieved throughout the 8-year study period. Segregation of Hispanos and whites dropped from 1968 to 1972, then increased to exceed 1968 levels in 1976. Segregation of Hispanos and blacks was high throughout the 8-year period, reaching a high point in 1972 and dropping below 1968 levels in 1976. Only the Dissimilarity Index showed a steady and accelerating decline from 1968 to 1976. This apparent decrease in segregation was probably mainly the result of the substantial increases in the proportion of Hispanos.

San Diego San Diego had the eighth largest Hispanic enrollment in 1968 and the ninth largest in 1972 and 1976. Total enrollment declined over the 8-year period as a result of decreased white enrollment, while black and Hispanic enrollment increased. The majority of students in San Diego were white; blacks and Hispanos constituted smaller but roughly equal proportions.

San Diego has been involved in litigation since 1974. Nevertheless, there has been no improvement in segregation of Hispanos. With one exception, all the indices of segregation increased over the period studied. There has never been any perceptible segregation of Hispanos from blacks in this district.

Denver Denver had the seventh largest Hispanic enrollment in the nation. Total enrollment decreased from 1968 to 1972 due to a loss of whites, and decreased further over the next 4 years as a result of fewer blacks and whites. Hispanos remained the largest minority group in Denver during the entire 8-year period, their numbers increasing steadily.

Denver has been involved in litigation since 1969 and under a court order to desegregate since 1973. The desegregation plan, in effect since 1974, relies on changes in school attendance zones and forced busing to effect desegregation.

The results of two years of desegregation are shown in the indices in 1976. Since whites constituted only 48% of all students in 1976, the 75% of Hispanic students who are in predominantly minority schools is not surprissing. Segregation of Hispanos and whites decreased dramatically, while segregation of Hispanos and blacks increased dramatically. These two changes have resulted in an overall decrease in segregation of Hispanos from non-Hispanos. The Dissimilarity index also decreased in 1976. From these changes it is evident that the desegregation plan is working to provide intermingling of whites with each minority group, but not intermingling of minority groups with each other.

Dade County (Miami) Dade County had the fourth highest Hispanic enrollment in 1968 and the third largest 8 years later. White enrollment decreased steadily over the 8 years while Hispanic and black enrollments increased. In 1976, 40% of all students were white, 31% were Hispano, and 28% were black.

The district has been operating under a court order to desegregate since 1970. As part of this order, a biracial, tri-ethnic advisory committee was established to monitor desegregation. In addition, the district has established large numbers of citizens' advisory committees which participate in developing and criticizing desegregation activities.

These activities have had mixed results for desegregation of Hispanos. The proportion of Hispanos in isolated schools increased steadily as a result of a loss of whites. Segregation of Hispanos and whites increased from 1968 to 1972 and decreased slightly thereafter. Meanwhile, segregation of Hispanos and blacks dropped dramatically from 1968 to 1972, then increased. The net result has been an initial decrease in segregation of Hispanos from non-Hispanos, followed by an increase. Only the Dissimilarity Index decreased over both 4-year periods; however, the drop between 1972 and 1976 was quite small.

Hillsborough County (Tampa) Hillsborough County had the tenth largest enrollment of Hispanos in 1968. However, while enrollment of blacks and whites increased, enrollment of Hispanos decreased. As a result, the district was 75.6% white and 19.6% black, but only 4.3% Hispano, in 1976.

Hillsborough County has been involved in litigation since 1958, but the court did not order desegregation until 1971. The court order requires individual schools to reflect the racial composition of the system as a whole and does not specifically address desegregation of Hispanos.

The changes in the indices reflect this omission. From 1968 to 1972 all but one of the indices decreased. Then segregation of Hispanos and whites increased as a direct result of desegregation of blacks, while segregation of Hispanos from blacks disappeared. The lack of segregation between Hispanos and blacks remained in 1976, but all other indices for Hispanos increased.

Chicago City Chicago had the third largest number of Hispanos in 1968 and the fourth largest in 1976. Total enrollment in Chicago declined steadily over the 8-year period. The decline between 1968 and 1972 resulted from a drop in white enrollment, while the decline over the next 4 years came from a decrease in both black and white enrollment. Meanwhile, Hispanic enrollment in Chicago increased. In 1976 Chicago was 59.6% black, 24.5% white, and 14.1% Hispanic.

School desegregation has been a long-standing problem in Chicago: The district has been found in noncompliance with the State and Federal civil rights regulations since 1964. The district has attempted voluntary compliance, but had not implemented an adequate desegregation plan by 1976. However, the lack of a plan had limited effect on Hispanic segregation.

The proportion of Hispanos in predominantly minority schools increased steadily over the 8 years, because of the decreased proportion of whites in the district. There was no segregation of Hispanos and whites during the entire 8-year period and the Dissimilarity index decreased. However, segregation of Hispanos and blacks did increase, resulting in an increase in segregation of Hispanos and non-Hispanos.

Albuquerque Albuquerque had the sixth largest number of Hispanic students in 1968 and 1976. Total enrollment increased from 1968 to 1972, then decreased. Meanwhile, enrollment of both Hispanos and blacks increased. In 1976 Albuquerque was 2.9% black, 41.5% Hispano , and 52% white.

Albuquerque has no reported history of litigation for desegregation. As a result, there were no dramatic changes in Hispanic segregation over the study period.

New York City New York City had the largest Hispanic enrollment in the nation throughout the study period. Hispanic and black enrollment increased over the 8 years, while white enrollment decreased. In 1976 New York City was 37.9% black, 30.5% white, and 29% Hispanic. The majority of Hispanos in New York City were Puerto Rican.

New York City adopted policies encouraging desegregation in the 1950s, but progress has been limited. In several instances, suits alleging discrimination have been filed and won. However, there is no systematic court-ordered desegregation plan in effect.

Despite the lack of a plan, there have been some changes in segregation of Hispanos, notably a steady increase in segregation of Hispanos from blacks (from being totally desegregated in 1968 to having 12% of the maximum feasible exposure to be achieved in 1976). This change has been accompanied by a decrease in Hispanic segregation from whites.

Dallas Dallas enrolled the ninth largest number of Hispanos in 1968 and the eighth largest in 1976. Total enrollment and white enrollment decreased over the 8 years, while black and Hispanic enrollment increased. In 1976 Dallas was 28% white, 47% black, and 14% Hispano.

Dallas has been operating under a court-ordered desegregation plan since before 1968. The most notable effect of this plan has been the elimination of segregation between Hispanos and whites in 1976.

Houston Houston enrolled the fifth largest number of Hispanos in both 1968 and 1976. While total and white enrollment decreased over the 8 years, enrollment of Hispanos and blacks increased. In 1976 Houston was 34% white, 43% black, and 22% Hispanic.

Houston has been operating under a court-ordered desegregation plan since before 1968. Segregation of Hispanos in Houston remained high throughout the study period. The most notable change was the drop in segregation of Hispanos from blacks in 1974, followed by a rise in 1976.

Projections

Basing projections of future segregation of Hispanic students on the period from 1968 to 1976 is risky. During these 8 years, school desegregation activities in most of the nation have focused on black students; in fact, concentration on black desegregation may have been the most significant factor accounting for observed trends in segregation of Hispanos. Toward the end of the period studied, the Hispanic community became increasingly politically active, and continuation of such activity may be the determining factor in future segregation trends. In addition, changes brought about by recently increased desegregation efforts in the ten school districts having large Hispanic enrollment, particularly in Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York City, will have a great impact on future segregation of Hispanos. We are entering a new period in desegregation of the public schools (and of Hispanic students). Thus, projections based on past performance are somewhat suspect.

Hispanic students already comprise the largest minority group in several school districts—and the largest single racial group in some. The growth in Hispanic enrollment from 1968 to 1976 shows no signs of slackening. Hence, by the early 1980s Hispanos are likely to make up the largest single minority group in even more districts at a time when white enrollment is decreasing. These two factors may combine to make segregation of Hispanic students as large a problem as segregation of black students has been—and desegregation with whites will probably be harder to achieve.

Segregation of Hispanos will likely increase in the early 1980s. Hispanic enrollment in predominantly minority schools will contine to increase as a direct result of decreased white enrollment. When coupled with continued efforts to desegregate blacks, this may result in increased segregation of Hispanos from whites. In fact, this may already be happening: 100 of the 247 districts in the matched sample showed an increased segregation of Hispanos and whites. Moreover, further analyses of the matched sample suggests that more districts will show decreased desegregation in the future.

Segregation of Hispanos from blacks has already started increasing, and it is likely that these increases will continue (75% of the matched sample showed definite increased segregation of Hispanic students from black students). Increased segregation of Hispanos from both whites and blacks will result in increased segregation of Hispanos from non-Hispanos.

The drop in the Dissimilarity Index from 1968 to 1976 probably was the result of the closing of small neighborhood schools, a trend that may continue. However, as the Hispanic community grows both in numbers and in political activity, there may be pressure to use small neighborhood schools in Hispanic communities. Eventually this would cause an increase in the Dissimilarity Index.

The most positive note for the future is not segregation within districts but segregation between districts. Although Hispanos will remain concentrated in relatively small numbers of districts, they probably will be better distributed among these districts. This is best predicted from the observed tendency of Hispanic students in most regions to leave central cities in favor of the suburbs.

All of these projections must be considered in light of desegregation efforts since 1976, when the most recent data analyzed in this study was collected. Several of the large districts are increasing efforts to desegregate, and if they are successful (as Denver has been), the projected increases in segregation may not materialize.

CHAPTER V.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HISPANIC SEGREGATION AND SPECIFIC SCHOOL PRACTICES

This section examines for Hispanos only, apparent relationships between segregation indices and the following school practices: Hispanic students and Hispanic participation in bilingual and special education programs; involvement in disciplinary action; rates of retention in grade, graduation, and dropping out; and presence of Hispanic professional staff. In this analyses segregation was taken to be segregation of Hispanos from non-Hispanos and the levels of segregation used throughout the discussion of relationships were based on values of this index— R(H,NH).

The procedure was as follows: the numbers of Hispanos and non-Hispanos in each program in a district were multiplied by the sampling weight for that district and those figures were aggregated for districts with similar levels of segregation. This provided an estimate of the number of students in all districts having the same level of segregation who were affected by the program or practice. Participation rates were computed after aggregation by dividing the number of students involved in the program by the total number of students enrolled. The following example illustrates how the information in the tables in this chapter should be interpreted: Hispanic participation in special education in districts having low values of R(H,NH) was 6.9% (Table V.5). This means that 6.9% of the estimated 683,250 Hispanics enrolled in these districts (see exhibit V.1) were included in some type of special education program.

Exhibit V.1 gives the estimated number of Hispanic students in each region and the nation enrolled in school districts having low, medium, and high levels of segregation. As can be seen, the majority of Hispanos were in districts having relatively high levels of segregation.

TABLE V.1

Hispanos and All Students, by Region and Level of Segregation in District

Region/Level of Segregation*	Hispanic Students		All Students
	Number	%	
East Coast			
Low	58,638	14	426,964
Medium	48,568	14	342,994
High	360,208	24	1,501,131
Total	467,414	21	2,271,088
South			
Low	9,365	5	190,032
Medium	0	0	0
High	75,447	30	252,931
Total	84,812	19	442,963
Midwest			
Low	47,938	11	432,961
Medium	28,213	24	117,426
High	95,682	16	601,544
Total	171,833	15	1,151,931
Southwest			
Low	547,306	21	2,646,842
Medium	312,180	31	1,007,369
High	542,720	31	1,726,192
Total	1,402,205	26	5,380,602
Other			
Low	20,004	7	270,542
Medium	6,896	11	64,016
High	875	17	5,003
Total	27,775	8	339,561
Total, all regions			
Low	683,250	17	3,967,341
Medium	395,857	26	1,532,003
High	1,074,932	26	4,086,801
Total	2,154,039	22	9,586,145

*Based on R(H,NH).

Bilingual Education

Bilingual education is important to the Hispanic community because Hispanos have the highest incidence of limited or non-English-speaking children. The logistics of providing bilingual programs may justify segregation of students. It is easier and more cost effective to provide such instruction to a large group of students of the same language background. However, active programs of bilingual education are too often blamed for the segregation of Hispanos between classrooms and even segregation between schools. While this type of segregation may be construed as a violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act, bilingual/bicultural education as provided through Title VII of ESEA (and some state programs of bilingual education) is to lead limited English proficiency (LEP) students and non-English speakers to eventual placement in regular classrooms. In addition, ESL and certain forms of bilingual education were practiced long before desegregation was a reality. To construe the process of bilingual education as causing segretion is to give the programs of bilingual education, which are quite limited in funds and actual practice, a much greater role than it has. While this may make good rhetoric, it is certainly not substantiated.

Although the highest participation in bilingual education is in districts having relatively higher levels of segregation, this fact may be simply a consequence of the vast number of Hispanos already attending segregated schools in the barrio. The conflict between bilingual education and desegregation is probably more greatly related to the fact that school administrators can more easily justify the maintenance of segregated schools through the support of bilingual education. But this juxtaposition cannot, itself, be the cause of segregation.

Need for Bilingual Education

A student's need for bilingual education is determined by the student's facility with the English language. In 1976 the Office for Civil Rights Elementary and Secondary Schools Civil Rights Survey collected counts of the number of students whose home language or primary language was other than English. The number and proportion of such Hispanic and non-Hispanic students are shown in table V.2. In all cases, Hispanos comprised the largest racial group of such students. The East Coast region had the highest proportion (41%) while the other three regions had between 20% and 24%. With the exception of the Midwest, moderately segregated districts showed the highest participation rates. This appears to be more a factor of the size of the Hispanic community than of segregation. In general, within each region the smaller the number of Hispanos the higher the proportion whose language was not English. This was not the case in the Midwest, where the need for bilingual education varied with the number of Hispanos. This difference in the Midwest is probably a reflection of the concentration of Hispanos in fewer districts.

TABLE V.2

Percentage of Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Students Whose Home Language is Other Than English, by Region and Level of Segregation in District, 1976

Region/Level of segregation*	Hispanic		Non-Hispanic	
	Number	%	Number	%
East Coast				
Low	27,980	47.68	6,116	1.66
Medium	23,344	48.48	5,809	1.97
High	132,442	38.71	33,111	2.90
Total	190,945	40.85	45,036	2.50
South				
Low	4,237	45.24	1,811	1.04
Medium	—	—	—	—
High	14,643	19.41	940	0.53
Total	18,880	22.28	13,328	0.79
Midwest				
Low	7,913	16.51	1,073	0.28
Medium	3,516	12.64	278	0.31
High	22,987	24.02	11,979	2.37
Total	34,466	20.06	13,328	1.36
Southwest				1.01
Low	192,087	27.74	21,181	2.72
Medium	98,744	30.99	18,944	0.93
High	93,811	17.29	11,083	1.29
Total	342,642	24.44	51,188	
Other				1.01
Low	1,347	6.73	2,537	0.12
Medium	1,044	19.14	68	—
High	—	—	—	0.83
Total	2,391	27.36	2,605	
Total, all regions				1.00
Low	193,543	28.33	32,788	2.21
Medium	124,897	31.59	25,097	1.90
High	270,883	25.20	57,089	1.55
Total	589,323	27.36	114,974	

*Based on R(H,M)

Receipt of Bilingual Education or ESL

The 1976 OCR survey also collected data on the number of students receiving bilingual education or instruction in English as a second language (ESL). No distinction was made between the two approaches to the language problem. (This is a major omission because this data collection procedure limits subsequent research analysis.)

Table V.3 shows the number of Hispanic and non-Hispanic students and the percentage of total Hispanic or non-Hispanic enrollment receiving bilingual education or ESL. The majority (85%) of students receiving bilingual education or ESL were Hispano. The East Coast had the largest proportion of Hispanic students receiving special language programs (21%) followed by the South, Midwest, and Southwest. Overall, 14% of Hispanos were recipients of such programs.*

The relationship between bilingual education and level of segregation is shown by the service rate—that is, the proportion of students who may need bilingual education (from Table V.3) to those who actually receive it (Table V.4). The South had the highest service rate, followed by the Midwest, East Coast, and Southwest. The expected relationship between segregation and bilingual education is evident: as segregation increased the service rate also increased. This relationship characterized all regions except the Midwest, where highly segregated districts had the highest rates and moderately segregated districts the lowest.

*It is important to indicate that many Hispanos receive ESL programs from Title I of the ESEA. These programs are nowhere sufficient to adequately meet the linguistic needs of LEP students and are qualitatively different from bilingual/bicultural programs. However, by our estimation, these programs constitute nearly half of all the programs reported in this study.

TABLE V.3

Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Students Receiving Bilingual Education or ESL, by Region and Level of Segregation in District, 1976

Region/Level of segregation*	Hispanic Students Number	%	Non-Hispanic Number	%
East Coast				
Low	12,543	21.39	2,424	0.66
Medium	10,993	22.63	3,493	1.19
High	76,597	21.26	19,568	1.72
Total	100,133	21.42	25,485	1.41
South				
Low	1,207	12.89	119	0.07
Medium	0	0.00	0	0.00
High	12,873	17.06	815	0.46
Total	14,080	16.60	934	0.26
Midwest				
Low	4,312	9.00	402	0.10
Medium	1,573	5.58	83	0.09
High	13,711	14.33	7,623	1.51
Total	19,597	11.40	8,108	0.83
Southwest				
Low	72,408	13.23	7,008	0.33
Medium	51,154	16.39	6,663	0.96
High	51,441	9.48	6,552	0.55
Total	175,003	12.48	20,223	0.51
Other				
Low	283	1.42	1,760	0.70
Medium	321	4.66	11	0.02
High	0	0.00	0	0.00
Total	604	2.17	1,771	0.57
Total, all regions				
Low	90,752	13.28	11,712	0.36
Medium	64,041	16.18	10,250	0.90
High	154,622	14.38	34,558	1.15
Total	309,416	14.36	56,520	0.76

*Based on R(H,NH).

TABLE V.4

Proportion Of Hispanic And Non-Hispanic Students
Who Receive Bilingual Education or ESL
(Service Rate), 1976

Region/Level of Segregation*	Hispanic	Non-Hispanic	All Students
East Coast			
Low	.45	.40	.44
Medium	.47	.60	.49
High	.55	.59	.56
All Districts	.52	.57	.53
South			
Low	.28	.06	.22
Medium	---	---	---
High	.88	.87	.88
All Districts	.75	.33	.69
Midwest			
Low	.54	.37	.52
Medium	.44	.30	.43
High	.60	.64	.61
All Districts	.57	.61	.58
Southwest			
Low	.48	.33	.46
Medium	.53	.35	.50
High	.55	.59	.55
All Districts	.51	.40	.50
Other			
Low	.21	.69	.53
Medium	.31	.17	.30
High	.55	.59	.55
All Districts	.51	.40	.50
Other			
Low	.21	.69	.53
Medium	.31	.17	.30
High	---	---	---
All Districts	.25	.68	.48
Total, all regions			
Low	.47	.36	.45
Medium	.51	.41	.50
High	.57	.61	.58
All Districts	.53	.49	.52

*Based on R(N,H).

Special Education

The evaluation of the relationship between segregation and special education examined participation in seven groupings of special education programs:

- All Special education excluding gifted/talented or advanced placement
- Educable mentally retarded or handicapped
- Trainable mentally retarded or handicapped
- Specific learning disabled
- Other psychological/emotional handicaps
- Physical/sensory or health related handicaps
- Gifted/talented or advanced placement

Participation in these programs, where offered, should be a good indication of the incidence of the special condition in the school population. However, there have been allegations that special education has been used as a means to segregate students, particularly when conditions are difficult to diagnose (such conditions as mild retardation, specific learning disabilities, and emotional disturbances). Judgments of school personnel may be a significant factor in assigning students to special education. These judgments may be affected by prejudice and may result in disproportionate assignment of minorities to special education programs. Such issues are particularly important for Hispanos because language limitations can complicate assessment of the need for special education.

Rules and regulations for section 504 of the Education of the Handicapped Act have addressed many of these problems; procedures that should limit or eliminate these problems have been specified.

In this evaluation it has been assumed that there may be differences in the incidence rates of handicaps for Hispanos and non-Hispanos caused by a variety of factors. Moreover, it has been assumed that these factors may be related to the factors that contribute to low or high segregation in a dis-

trict. Given these assumptions, the special education rates for Hispanos and non-Hispanos would vary. The relationship of segregation on receipt of special education may be shown by differences in the variation by level of segregation for Hispanos and non-Hispanos.

Nationwide, Hispanic and non-Hispanic participation rates varied in the same way for physical/sensory or health-related handicaps, other psychological/emotional handicaps, specific learning disabilities, and gifted/talented or advanced placement. These are conditions that can be diagnosed readily or are adequately covered by regulations that tend to prevent discrimination in the identification of children. However, participation in programs for mental retardation did not vary identically for both Hispanos and non-Hispanos.

The following paragraphs discuss participation in each of the special education programs. For those programs that show similar variations among Hispanos and non-Hispanos, possible effects of the extent of segregation on participation rates are discussed. For the remaining programs (e.g. mental retardation) the different variations with level of segregation are discussed.

A number of other factors may contribute to participation rates for Hispanos as well as different variations in participation with level of segregation. Further research is required to identify and separate the effects of these other factors.

All Special Education

Table V.5 shows the numbers and percentages of Hispanos and non-Hispanos in all special education programs, by level of segregation and region. Nationwide, Hispanic participation in the program was only slightly lower than non-Hispanic participation.

Hispanic participation in special education decreased with higher levels of segregation except in the East Coast where participation was highest in moderately segregated districts. The variation for Hispanos was paralleled by non-Hispanos, except in the Midwest, where non-Hispanic participation was lowest in moderately segregated districts, and in the nation as a whole, which showed highest rates in moderately segregated districts (See Table V.5).

TABLE V.5

Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Students Participating in all Special Education Programs*, by region and Level of Segregation in District, 1976

Region/Level Segregation**	Hispanic Students Number	%	Non-Hispanic Students Number	%
East Coast				
Low	2,464	4.20	15,960	4.33
Medium	3,308	6.81	21,016	7.14
High	14,874	4.13	46,261	4.05
Total	20,645	4.42	83,238	4.61
South				
Low	604	6.45	13,033	7.21
Medium	—	—	—	—
High	4,217	5.59	11,536	6.50
Total	4,821	5.68	24,569	6.86
Midwest				
Low	3,600	7.31	25.929	6.73
Medium	1,936	6.86	5,509	6.17
High	5,538	5.79	38,441	7.60
Total	11,074	6.44	69,878	7.13
Southwest				
Low	38,911	7.11	139,943	6.67
Medium	19,329	6.26	44,849	6.45
High	28,138	5.18	57,621	4.87
Total	86,378	6.17	242,413	6.09
Other				
Low	1,695	8.48	14,125	5.84
Medium	780	11.32	4,166	7.29
High	35	4.00	210	5.09
Total	2,511	9.04	18,501	5.93
Total, all regions				
Low	47,274	6.92	208,990	6.36
Medium	29,354	6.46	75,540	6.65
High	52,801	4.91	154,070	5.12
Total	129,629	5.83	438,600	5.90

*Excluding gifted/talented and advanced placement programs.
**Based on R(H,NH).

Educable Mentally Retarded or Handicapped (EMR/EMH)

Hispanic participation in EMR/EMH programs was generally lower than non-Hispanic participation (see Table V.6). The East Coast region showed higher rates, except in highly segregated districts. In the Southwest, Hispanic rates were consistently higher than non-Hispanic rates. This may reflect a higher indicence rate among Hispanos, or misdiagnosis associated with the cultural/linguistic background of the students, or prejudice.

Hispanic participation in EMR/EMH programs was lowest in highly segregated districts except in the Southwest and the nation as a whole where Hispanic participation was lowest in low-segregated districts.

In the Midwest and the Southwest EMR/EMH participation rates for Hispanos did not vary in the same way as did rates for non-Hispanos. Variability for Hispanos was not consistent as with non-Hispanic participation rates which increased in highly segregated districts. When the corresponding increase in the number of students identified as having language problems is considered, it appears that there may be some confusion between EMR/EMH problems and language problems—that is, students identifiable as EMR/EMH. It appears from our data that this is more likely to occur in low segregated districts than high segregated districts.

TABLE V.6

Hispanic And Non-Hispanic Students Participating In Programs For The Educable Mentally Retarded Or Educable Mentally Handicapped, By Region And Level Of Segregation In District, 1976

Region	Level of Segregation*	Number of students		Percentage of enrollment	
		Hispanos	Other	Hispanos	Other
East Coast	All	5518	21975	1.19	1.22
	Low	768	4546	1.31	1.23
	Medium	915	4384	1.88	1.49
	High	3836	13046	1.06	1.14
South	All	650	5305	0.77	1.48
	Low	98	3242	1.05	1.79
	Medium	0	0	0.00	0.00
	High	552	2063	0.73	1.16
Midwest	All	2708	20470	1.58	2.09
	Low	879	6437	1.83	1.67
	Medium	447	1030	1.58	1.15
	High	1381	13003	1.44	2.57
Southwest	All	11901	25727	0.85	0.65
	Low	4245	11099	0.78	0.53
	Medium	2943	5266	0.94	0.76
	High	4712	9361	0.87	0.79
Other	All	452	3472	1.63	1.11
	Low	300	2674	1.50	1.07
	Medium	136	679	1.97	1.19
	High	17	119	1.94	2.88
All regions	All	21229	76949	0.99	1.04
	Low	6290	27997	0.92	0.85
	Medium	4441	11359	1.12	1.00
	High	10498	37592	0.98	1.25

*Based on R(H,NH).

Trainable Mentally Retarded or Handicapped (TMR/TMH)

As TMR/TMH is a more severe mental retardation, participation rates in programs for the trainable mentally retarded are more likely to reflect actual incidence than discriminatory classification.

Hispanic participation in programs for TMR/TMH generally was greater than non-Hispanic participation (see table V.7). This relationship did not characterize all regions: in the Midwest and East Coast, Hispanic participation was lower. Nationwide, Hispanic participation was lower than non-Hispanic in highly segregated districts only; however, the difference was slight (less than one in ten thousand students).

In all regions, the participation rates for Hispanos and non-Hispanos varied in the same way. This suggests that, region by region, there is no particular discriminatory use of TMR programs. However, in the nation as a whole, non-Hispanic participation increased steadily with increased segregation, but Hispanic participation dropped off for highly segregated districts. This may be a result of failure to locate and diagnose Hispanos who require these programs in the highly segregated districts.

TABLE V.7

Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Students Participating in Programs for the Trainable Mentally Retarded Or Trainable Mentally Handicapped, by Region and Level of Segregation in District, 1976

Region	Level of Segregation*	Number of Students		Percentage of enrollment	
		Hispanos	Other	Hispanos	Other
East Coast	All	1301	5271	0.28	0.29
	Low	132	600	0.23	0.16
	Medium	132	812	0.27	0.28
	High	1036	3859	0.29	0.34
South	All	297	1115	0.35	0.31
	Low	54	667	0.58	0.37
	Medium	---	---	---	---
	High	243	448	0.32	0.25
Midwest	All	250	2383	0.15	0.24
	Low	48	901	0.10	0.23
	Medium	22	52	0.08	0.06
	High	180	1430	0.19	0.28
Southwest	All	3596	7884	0.26	0.20
	Low	1174	3317	0.21	0.16
	Medium	951	1868	0.30	0.27
	High	1471	2699	0.27	0.23
Other	All	69	712	0.25	0.23
	Low	54	573	0.27	0.23
	Medium	15	133	0.22	0.23
	High	0	[illegible]	0.00	0.15
All regions	All	5513	17366	0.26	0.23
	Low	1462	6058	0.21	0.18
	Medium	1121	2866	0.28	0.25
	High	2930	8442	0.27	0.28

*Based on R(H,NH).

Specific Learning Disabled (SLD)

One concern in the identification and instruction of specific learning disabled children is that cultural or language background differences might cause overrepresentation of Hispanos in these programs. This concern is not supported by the data gathered for this study. Although Hispanic participation was greater, the difference between the two groups was quite small—less than 1 in 1,000 students in all major regions and less than 1 in 10,000 for the nation (Table V.8).

In the Midwest, Hispanic participation rates not only exceeded non-Hispanic rates, but they varied differently by level of segregation. Hispanic participation rates decreased as level of segregation increased, while non-Hispanic rates peaked in moderately segregated districts. As a result, these 6 more Hispanic students per 1,000 were classified as SLD in low segregation districts and 2 less per 1,000 in high segregation districts than for non-Hispanos. This suggests that there may be some classification problem for Hispanos in the desegregated districts of the Midwest.

TABLE V.8

Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Students Participating in Programs for the Specific Learning Disabled, by Region and Level of Segregation in District, 1976

Region	Level of Segregation*	Number of students		Percentage of enrollment	
		Hispanos	Other	Hispanos	Other
East Coast	All	2711	13942	0.58	0.77
	Low	359	4060	0.61	1.10
	Medium	553	4085	1.14	1.39
	High	1799	5797	0.50	0.51
South	All	1864	7274	2.20	2.03
	Low	135	2810	1.44	1.56
	Medium	---	---	---	---
	High	1729	4464	2.29	2.52
Midwest	All	3217	17423	1.87	1.78
	Low	1178	7167	2.46	1.86
	Medium	578	1680	2.05	1.88
	High	1461	8576	1.53	1.70
Southwest	All	36053	107639	2.57	2.71
	Low	15652	62542	2.86	2.98
	Medium	7363	18001	2.36	2.59
	High	13038	27096	2.40	2.29
Other	All	1364	9319	4.91	2.99
	Low	929	7360	4.65	2.94
	Medium	434	1923	6.30	3.37
	High	0	35	0.00	0.85
All regions	All	45209	155596	2.10	2.09
	Low	18254	83939	2.67	2.56
	Medium	8928	25689	2.26	2.26
	High	18027	45968	1.68	1.53

*Based on R(H,NH)

Other Psychological/Emotional Handicaps

Participation in programs for other psychological or emotional handicaps was generally higher with increased segregation (Table V.9). However, the pattern was not consistent across regions. In most instances, Hispanic participation in these programs was lower than non-Hispanic participation, and the patterns of Hispanic and non-Hispanic participation by level of segregation for the regions were identical. Hence, participation in these programs does not appear to be related to segregation.

TABLE V.9

Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Students Participating in Programs for other Psychological/Emotional Handicaps, by Region and Level of Segregation in District, 1976

Region	Level of Segregation*	Number of students		Percentage of enrollment	
		Hispanics	Other	Hispanics	Other
East Coast	All	3081	10551	0.66	0.59
	Low	72	1031	0.12	0.28
	Medium	120	1195	0.25	0.41
	High	2889	8325	0.80	0.73
South	All	216	1541	0.25	0.43
	Low	34	1002	0.36	0.55
	Medium	—	—	—	—
	High	182	539	0.24	0.30
Midwest	All	604	5986	0.35	0.61
	Low	179	2030	0.37	0.53
	Medium	32	216	0.11	0.24
	High	393	3720	0.41	0.74
Southwest	All	1610	8343	0.11	0.21
	Low	558	4105	0.10	0.20
	Medium	440	1732	0.14	0.25
	High	612	2506	0.11	0.21
Other	All	200	1554	0.72	0.50
	Low	135	1162	0.67	0.46
	Medium	65	393	0.94	0.69
	High	—	—	—	—
All regions	All	5712	27955	0.27	0.38
	Low	979	9329	0.14	0.28
	Medium	657	3536	0.17	0.31
	High	4076	15090	0.38	0.50

*Based on R(H,NH).

Physical/Sensory or Health Related Handicaps

There was no apparent relationship between level of segregation and Hispanic participation in programs for the physical/sensory, or health related handicaps (Table V.10). With the exception of the South, Hispanic participation in these programs was somewhat greater than participation of non-Hispanos. The patterns of increases and decreases in all major regions were identical.

TABLE V.10

Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Students Participating in Programs for Physical/Sensory or Health Relayed Handicaps, by Region and Level of Segregation in District, 1976

Region	Level of Segregation*	Number of students		Percentage of enrollment	
		Hispanics	Other	Hispanics	Other
East Coast	All	7171	21223	1.53	1.78
	Low	885	4300	1.31	1.17
	Medium	981	4274	2.02	1.43
	High	5305	12719	1.47	1.11
South	All	1794	9334	2.12	2.61
	Low	283	5312	3.02	2.94
	Medium	—	—	—	—
	High	1511	4022	2.00	2.27
Midwest	All	4295	23638	2.50	2.41
	Low	1315	9394	2.74	2.44
	Medium	857	2530	3.04	2.84
	High	2123	11714	2.22	2.32
Southwest	All	33560	94179	2.39	2.37
	Low	17327	59167	3.17	2.82
	Medium	7852	18335	2.52	2.64
	High	8381	16677	1.54	1.41
Other	All	425	3444	1.53	1.10
	Low	277	2356	1.38	0.94
	Medium	130	1038	1.89	1.82
	High	18	50	2.06	1.21
All regions	All	47245	151818	2.19	2.04
	Low	20088	80528	2.94	2.45
	Medium	9820	26108	2.48	2.30
	High	17338	45182	1.61	1.50

*Based on P(H,NH).

Gifted/Talented or Advanced Placement

There was no apparent relationship between level of segregation and participation in gifted/talented or advanced placement programs. In general, Hispanic participation was lower than non-Hispanic participation (See Table V.11). Participation was greatest in the East Coast region and lowest in the South. Changes in participation by level of segregation differed with region, but the patterns of change for Hispanos and non- Hispanos were similar.

TABLE V.11

Hispanic And Non-Hispanic Students Participating in Gifted/Talented And Advanced Placement Programs, By Region And Level of Segregation Of Districts, 1976

Region	Level of Segregation*	Number of students		Percentage of enrollment	
		Hispanos	Other	Hispanos	Other
East Coast	All	21627	142083	4.63	7.88
	Low	933	19057	1.69	5.17
	Medium	853	13237	1.76	4.50
	High	19782	109789	5.49	9.62
South	All	271	3845	0.32	1.07
	Low	52	2000	0.56	1.11
	Medium	—	—	—	—
Midwest	All	5235	66177	3.45	6.75
	Low	1417	22820	2.96	5.93
	Medium	1345	5843	4.41	6.55
	High		37514	3.42	7.42
Southwest	All	31781	223397	2.27	5.62
	Low	14413	127811	2.63	6.09
	Medium	5700	40453	1.83	5.82
	High	11668	55133	2.15	4.66
Other	All	328	6615	1.78	2.12
	Low	272	5706	1.36	2.28
	Medium	56	909	0.81	1.39
	High	—	—	—	—
All regions	All	59943	442117	2.78	5.95
	Low	17146	177394	2.51	5.40
	Medium	7854	60412	1.98	5.32
	High	34942	204261	3.25	6.78

*Based on R(H,NH).

Disciplinary Action

Our analyses examined two forms of disciplinary action--suspensions (mildly severe action) and expulsions (severe action). Since inter-racial tension is often higher in desegregated schools, it is not surprising to find the lowest discipline rates for Hispanos in highly segregated districts. In fact, all regions and the nation as a whole showed definite drops in explusion rates from low to medium to highly segregated districts (Table V.12).

TABLE V. 12

Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Students Expelled from School, by Region and Level of Segregation in District, 1976

Region	Level of Segregation*	Number of students		Percentage of enrollment	
		Hispanos	Other	Hispanos	Other
East Coast	All	37	272	0.008	0.015
	Low	26	142	0.044	0.039
	Medium	7	48	0.014	0.016
	High	4	82	0.001	0.007
South	All	2	39	0.002	0.011
	Low	2	35	0.021	0.019
	Medium	—	—	—	—
	High	0	4	0.000	0.002
Midwest	All	93	594	0.054	0.061
	Low	58	444	0.122	0.115
	Medium	22	46	0.078	0.052
	High	13	104	0.014	0.021
Southwest	All	836	3338	0.060	0.084
	Low	453	1738	0.083	.084
	Medium	216	493	0.069	0.071
	High	166	1088	0.031	0.092
Other	All	76	345	0.272	0.111
	Low	64	197	0.318	0.079
	Medium	12	141	0.174	0.247
	High	0	7	0.000	0.170
All regions	All	1044	4588	0.049	0.062
	Low	603	2579	0.088	0.078
	Medium	257	728	0.065	0.064
	High	183	1285	0.017	0.043

*Based on R(H,NH).

The East Coast and Southwest regions and the nation as a whole showed the highest suspension rates for moderately segregated districts. This is probably related to a high degree of interracial strife in these districts, increased cultural differences between teachers and students, lack of loyalty to new and distant schools, etc. (Table V.13)

TABLE V.13

Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Students Suspended from School, by Region and Level of Segregation in District, 1976

Region	Level of Segregation*	Number of students		Percentage of enrollment	
		Hispanos	Other	Hispanos	Other
East Coast	All	7178	46884	1.54	2.60
	Low	3477	23169	5.93	6.29
	Medium	2888	18195	5.95	6.18
	High	813	5520	0.23	0.48
South	All	1341	13214	1.58	3.69
	Low	597	9240	6.37	5.11
	Medium	0	0	0.00	0.00
	High	744	3974	0.99	2.24
Midwest	All	7642	53907	4.45	5.50
	Low	3494	29043	7.29	7.54
	Medium	1267	2596	4.49	2.91
	High	2881	22268	3.01	4.40
Southwest	All	52269	173598	3.73	4.36
	Low	21437	92467	3.92	4.40
	Medium	13736	30215	4.40	4.35
	High	17097	50915	3.15	4.30
Other	All	1562	8325	5.62	2.67
	Low	1006	4725	5.03	1.89
	Medium	541	3494	7.85	6.12
	High	15	106	1.71	2.57
All regions	All	69993	295927	3.25	3.98
	Low	30011	158643	4.39	4.83
	Medium	18432	54500	4.66	4.80
	High	21550.	82784.	2.00	2.75

*Based on R(H,NH).

Retention in Grade, Graduation, and Dropping Out

Retention, graduation, and dropout rates are all measures of how students progress through school. Retention delays graduation and may cause higher dropout rates, which in turn reduce graduation rates. Unfortunately, the available data did not permit examination of the interrelationships among these three rates. Retention rates were available for all students in a district for the 1972-73 school year (Table V.14). Dropout rates were available for all students in 1976. High school graduation rates were available in 1976. A limitation in computing graduation rates is that they are the proportion of all Hispanic students (not just secondary school students) by the general level of segregation rather than segregation for secondary schools. Nationwide, retention of Hispanic students in grade was highest in moderately segregated districts. The change in retention by level of segregation for non-Hispanos was quite similar to that for Hispanos. The national trend was duplicated in the East Coast and the South, while the Southwest and Midwest retention was highest in highly segregated districts. This suggests that some factor other than segregation was affecting retention of students.

High school graduation rates for Hispanos are generally lower than for non-Hispanos in addition, as segregation decreased, the graduation rates tended to improve. This may be evidence of a beneficial outcome of desegregated school districts. However, further research is needed before

TABLE V.14

Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Students Retained in the Same Grade, by Region and Level of Segregation in District, 1972

Region	Level of Segregation*	Number of students		Percentage of enrollment	
		Hispanos	Other	Hispanos	Other
East Coast	All	8382	29167	2.06	1.90
	Low	1317	4305	3.43	1.88
	Medium	1724	8325	3.80	2.59
	High	5341	16537	1.66	1.68
South	All	1699	5611	2.42	1.82
	Low	228	2178	2.65	1.87
	Medium	49	141	3.83	1.49
	High	1779	16224	2.08	2.82
Midwest	All	2788	21793	1.90	2.08
	Low	547	3374	1.69	1.02
	Medium	462	2195	1.59	1.50
	High	1779	16224	2.08	2.82
Southwest	All	26991	49279	2.19	1.19
	Low	8896	20190	1.97	0.97
	Medium	6074	9689	2.24	1.24
	High	12022	19399	2.36	1.53
Other	All	205	847	1.22	0.63
	Low	113	385	1.43	0.66
	Medium	77	319	0.96	0.46
	High	15	143	1.62	1.73
All regions	All	40066	106697	2.14	1.49
	Low	11101	30433	2.06	1.08
	Medium	8386	20669	2.36	1.56
	High	20579	55595	2.10	1.84

*Based on R(H,NH).

this assertion can be made with any great degree of confidence.

Dropout rates for Hispanos are highest in highly segregated school districts. This data suggests that in more highly segregated districts Hispanos are more likely to drop out of school. The rates for both groups varied in the same way by level of segregation for each region. (See Tables V.15, V.16.)

Segregation and Hispanic Professional Staff

Exhibit V.17 shows the number of Hispanic professional staff by region and level of segregation in the district in 1968, 1972, and 1976. As with Hispanic students, more Hispanic professional staff were in highly segregated districts—48% nationwide in 1968 and 43% in 1976. In the regions, the proportions of staff in highly segregated districts remained relatively constant over the 8-year study period except in the Southwest, where the proportion decreased markedly. These patterns are generally consistent with patterns of attendance for Hispanic students.

Viewing Hispanic staff as a proportion of all professional staff gives a different picture. (See exhibit V.17.) Nationwide, moderately segregated districts had the highest proportion of Hispanic staff in all years, but the pattern varied over regions. In 1976 these patterns were fairly similar to the pattern of percent Hispanic by level of segregation. They diverge only in the Southwest and for the nation as a whole, where the proportion of Hispanic staff followed the same pattern as student participation in bilingual education and ESL. This suggests that two factors are related to the composition of the staff. Where there tends to be greater concentrations of Hispanic students, there are high concentrations of Hispanic staff. Where this is not the case, the high concentration of Hispanic staff are found where there are more active bilingual education programs.

TABLE V. 15

Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Students Graduating from High School, by Region and Level of Segregation in District, 1976

Region	Level of Segregation*	Number of students		Percentage of enrollment**	
		Hispanos	Other	Hispanos	Other
East Coast	All	14212	98795	3.04	5.48
	Low	2090	24066	3.56	6.53
	Medium	1122	16199	2.31	5.50
	High	11000	58529	3.05	5.13
South	All	4529	22124	5.34	6.18
	Low	549	10375	5.86	5.74
	Medium	0	0	0.00	0.00
	High	3980	11749	5.28	6.62
Midwest	All	4925	50382	2.37	5.14
	Low	2039	29592	4.25	7.69
	Medium	1236	5676	4.38	6.36
	High	1650	15114	1.72	2.99
Southwest	All	54401	229496	3.88	5.77
	Low	25909	133399	4.73	6.35
	Medium	13943	45676	4.47	6.57
	High	14549	50421	2.68	4.26
Other	All	1489	20704	5.36	6.64
	Low	1191	16463	5.96	6.57
	Medium	257	3998	3.73	7.00
	High	41	243	4.69	5.89
All regions	All	79556	421501	3.69	5.67
	Low	31778	213895	4.65	6.51
	Medium	16558	71550	4.18	6.30
	High	31220	136056	2.90	4.52

*Based on R(H,NH).

**Graduation rates are the proportion of all Hispanos or others enrolled who graduated from high school.

TABLE V.16

Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Students Dropping out of School, by Region and Level of Segregation in District, 1976

Region	Level of Segregation	Number of students		Percentage of enrollment	
		Hispanos	Other	Hispanos	Other
East Coast	All	4193	28009	0.90	1.55
	Low	1531	7912	2.61	2.15
	Medium	1482	7681	3.05	2.61
	High	1180	12415	0.33	1.09
South	All	4422	12722	5.21	3.55
	Low	257	5753	2.74	3.18
	Medium	---	---	---	---
	High	4165	6969	5.52	3.93
Midwest	All	3655	17013	2.13	1.74
	Low	1664	10403	3.47	2.70
	Medium	805	1380	2.85	1.55
	High	1186	5230	1.24	1.03
Southwest	All	29244	68772	2.09	1.73
	Low	12955	34462	2.37	1.64
	Medium	8213	13887	2.63	2.00
	High	8076	20423	1.49	1.73
Other	All	712	3532	2.56	1.13
	Low	483	2495	2.41	1.00
	Medium	219	983	3.17	1.72
	High	11	54	1.26	1.31
All regions	All	42226	130048	1.96	1.75
	Low	16890	61024	2.47	1.86
	Medium	10719	23932	2.71	2.11
	High	14618	45901	1.36	1.50

*Based on R(H,NH).

TABLE V.17.

Hispanic Professional Staff, By Region And Level of Segregation in District

Region/Level of segregation*	1968 No. of Hispanic	1968 % of all prof. staff	1972 No. of Hispanic	1972 % of all prof. staff	1976 No. of Hispanic	1976 % of al prof. s
East Coast						
All	743	0.88	2,451	2.18	3,864	2.98
Low	57	0.73	272	1.73	463	1.79
Medium	23	0.40	304	1.48	457	1.90
High	663	0.91	1,875	2.47	2,965	3.66
South						
All	803	5.12	1,048	5.79	1,926	7.61
Low	11	2.23	469	7.35	546	2.36
Medium	439	9.18	10	1.76	—	—
High	353	3.39	569	5.10	1,380	9.45
Midwest						
All	430	0.91	1,117	1.92	2,167	3.43
Low	91	1.21	283	1.61	571	2.46
Medium	68	0.96	259	3.17	438	6.34
High	271	0.83	594	1.75	1,158	3.49
Southwest						
All	9,862	4.31	15,030	6.00	22,101	8.24
Low	2,978	3.27	5,826	4.94	9,342	7.31
Medium	2,530	5.22	3,401	6.72	5,050	9.64
High	4,354	4.87	5,804	7.06		
Other						
All	37		103			
Low	17		37			
Medium	8		63			
High	12		3			
All regions						
All	11,875	3.11	19,749	4.42		
Low	3,154	2.89	6,886	4.29		
Medium	3,068	4.49	4,058	4.79		
High	5,653	2.77	8,805	4.37		

*Based on R(H,NH).

********Last two columns (1976) continued on next page********

CHAPTER VI

COMPARISON OF TRENDS IN SEGREGATION OF HISPANIC AND BLACK STUDENTS

To compare segregation of Hispanic and black students, indices of segregation of blacks comparable to those for Hispanos were defined. (See Appendix A.) The indices for blacks were computed for districts in samples I and II and used to estimate segregation indices in the universe. Since the universe does not provide nearly as extensive coverage of blacks in the nation's public schools as it does for Hispanos, the trends discussed in this section could vary from those for blacks throughout the country. However, the trends do represent patterns for blacks in major school districts having significant Hispanic enrollment.

National Trends

Segregation of blacks is greater than segregation of Hispanos, but decreased between 1968 and 1976 by larger amounts than did segregation of Hispanos.

Segregation Measured by the Isolation Index E(B,M,50%) (Table VI.1)

The proportion of blacks in predominantly minority schools was consistently higher than the proportion of Hispanos in such schools. However, the proportion of Hispanos in isolated schools increased throughout, from 1968 to 1972 and from 1972 to 1976. There was a net decrease in the proportion of blacks in isolated schools over the 8-year period studied and a net increase in the proportion of Hispanos. This difference may be a direct result of desegregation activities which concentrate on desegregating blacks and whites.

TABLES VI.1

Values for the Isolation Index for Blacks

School Level	1968	1972	1976
All schools	.847	.805	.833
Elementary schools	.893	.860	.857
Secondary schools	.761	.724	.767

Estimated Number in Isolated Schools

School Level	1968	1972	1976
All schools	1,301,577	1,489,494	1,803,074
Elementary schools	883,971	930,867	1,005,936
Secondary schools	408,685	526,895	720,190

Increases in Isolated Enrollment

School Level	1968-72	1972-76
All schools	187,917	313,580
Elementary schools	46,896	75,070
Secondary schools	118,209	193,295

Proportion of Enrollment Increase in Isolated Schools

School Level	1968-72	1972-76
All schools	60%	99%
Elementary schools	51%	82%
Secondary schools	62%	92%

Segregation Measured by the Segregation Indices (Table VI.2)

Segregation from other-race students Segregation of blacks from non-blacks as measured by R(B,NB), was considerably more severe than segregation of Hispanos from non-Hispanos. However, the decrease in segregation of blacks was greater than the decrease in segregation of Hispanos. For Hispanos and blacks, the majority of the decrease occurred between 1968 and 1972.

Segregation from whites Segregation of blacks from whites, as measured by R(B,W), was more severe than segregation of Hispanos from whites. The decreases in segregation were greater for blacks than for Hispanos, but the percentage decrease over the 8-year period was the same for Hispanos and blacks.

TABLE VI.2.

Values of the Indices of Segregation [R(B,NB)] of Blacks From Other Students Nationwide

Index/School level	Year of survey 1968	1972	1976
Segregation of blacks from non-blacks--R(B,NB)			
All schools	.564	.460	.423
Elementary schools	.620	.530	.487
Secondary schools	.467	.357	.315
Segregation of blacks from whites--R(B,W)			
All schools	.652	.542	.496
Elementary schools	.719	.626	.574
Secondary schools	.545	.432	.379

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation. Values for the index can be interpreted as the percentage of students needing reassignment in order to achieve the district-wide proportion.

Segregation Measured by the Dissimilarity Index (Table VI.3)

Higher proportions of blacks than Hispanos would be reassigned to different schools if model assignment practices were followed. However, the proportion for blacks who would be reassigned decreased more rapidly than that of Hispanos. Over the 8-year period the drop in the Dissimilarity index kept up with the increases in black enrollment. There was a decrease in the number of blacks who would be reassigned, but an increase in the number of Hispanos.

TABLE VI.3

Dissimilarity Of Black Student Assignment From Model Practice Nation-Wide Based On D(B,T)

Indicator/School level	Year of survey 1968	1972	1976
Values of the Dissimilarity Index*			
All schools	.440	.356	.311
Elementary schools	.456	.383	.343
Secondary schools	.410	.312	.257
	Period surveyed 1968-72	1972-76	1968-76
Change in number who would be reassigned			
All schools	-17,436	+14,469	- 2,967
Elementary schols	-36,829	-11,951	-48,780
Secondary schools	+ 6,874	+14,256	+21,130
Percentage of net change in black enrollment that would be reassigned			
All schools	<0	5	<0
Elementary schools	<0	<0	<0
Secondary schools	4	7	5

*The higher the value of the index, the greater the divergence from the model assignment practice.

Regional Trends

East Coast (Table VI.4)

Districts in the East Coast region accounted for 32% of all black students in the universe in 1972 and 43% in 1976. The majority of these students were in districts having a moderate percentage of Hispanos. As with Hispanos in this region, the overwhelming majority of blacks (90% or more) were in large, central city districts.

Isolation In the East Coast region, the proportion of blacks in predominantly minority schools was lower than that of Hispanos in 1968 and 1972; but higher in 1976. While the proportion of Hispanos in isolated schools decreased, the proportion of blacks in such schools increased steadily.

Segregation of blacks from non-blacks In the East Coast region this was somewhat greater than segregation of Hispanos from non-Hispanos. Moreover, while segregation of Hispanos from non-Hispanos decreased. segregation of blacks from non-blacks increased.

Segregation from whites Blacks and Hispanos on the East Coast region showed different levels of segregation from whites and different segregation trends. In 1968, segregation of Hispanos from whites in all schools exceeded segregation of blacks from whites in all schools. During the next 4 years, segregation of Hispanos decreased more than segregation of blacks in all schools so that by 1972 blacks were more segregated than Hispanos. Between 1972 and 1976, segregation of Hispanos continued to decline while segregation of blacks rose, and by 1976 blacks were considerably more segregated than Hispanos.

Dissimilarity The proportion of blacks who would have to be reassigned to conform to the model assignment practice was lower than that of Hispanos. The Dissimilarity index decreased for both blacks and Hispanos.

TABLE VI.4

Values of Segregation Indices of Black Students in the East Coast Region

Index/School Level	1968	1972	1976
Isolation--E (B,M,30%)			
All schools	.810	.820	.898
Elementary schools	.863	.872	.896
Secondary schools	.709	.739	.833
R Index From non-blacks--R(B,NB)			
All schools	.331	.327	.365
Elementary schools	.389	.388	.422
Secondary schools	.226	.233	.269
From whites--R(B,W)			
All schools	.475	.471	.492
Elementary schools	.559	.562	.573
Secondary schools	.345	.355	.371
Dissimilarity--D(B,T)			
All schools	.300	.287	.257
Elementary schools	.319	.316	.288
Secondary schools	.261	.242	.203

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.

South (Table VI.5)

Districts in the South accounted for 5% of the black students in the universe. This is slightly higher than the proportion of Hispanic students in the universe in Southern districts. As with Hispanos, the majority of blacks in this region (more than 96%) were in large districts. However, while 83-89% of Hispanos were in suburban districts, only 73-77% of blacks were. Hence, there was some separation of Hispanos from blacks between districts.

Isolation The South showed radically different trends in isolation of Hispanos and blacks. Between 1968 and 1976 isolation increased for Hispanos and decreased for blacks. As a result, the proportions of Hispanos in predominantly minority schools exceeded the proportion of blacks in 1972 and 1976. Moreover, the gap between the two widened. In 1972, the proportion of blacks in isolated schools was only 3.3% less than the proportion of Hispanos, but by 1976 that figure had risen to nearly 14%.

Segregation from other-race students In 1968, blacks were considerably more segregated than Hispanos. However, during the next 4 years, segregation of blacks decreased substantially, while segregation of Hispanos dropped only slightly, so that by 1972, blacks were still more segregated than Hispanos but by a much smaller amount. The decrease in black segregation continued while Hispanic segregation increased. By 1976 the difference between segregation of blacks and segregation of Hispanos was much smaller than in earlier years.

TABLE VI.3

Values of Indices of Segregation of Black Students in The South*

Index/School Level	1968	1972	1976
Isolation—E (B,H,50%)			
All schools	.843	.575	.571
Elementary schools	.911	.648	.647
Secondary schools	.747	.489	.493
R Index			
From non-blacks—R(B,NB)			
All schools	.762	.309	.306
Elementary schools	.838	.378	.379
Secondary Schools	.659	.226	.223
From whites—R(B,W)			
All schools	.778	.333	.319
Elementary schools	.861	.402	.399
Secondary schools	.668	.250	.229
Dissimilarity—D(B,T)			
All schools	.633	.353	.344
Elementary schools	.658	.388	.385
Secondary schools	.591	.300	.297

*Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.

Segregation from whites In 1968 segregation of blacks was considerably greater than segregation of Hispanos. However, segregation of blacks dropped rapidly from 1968 to 1972 and continued to drop during the next 4 years, while segregation of Hispanos increased throughout the period. As a result, the gap between segregation of blacks and segregation of Hispanos was considerably smaller in 1976 than in either 1968 or 1972; in fact, Hispanic segregation exceeded black segregation for secondary schools in 1976.

Dissimilarity A larger proportion of blacks than Hispanos would be reassigned under the model assignment practices. The difference was most extreme in 1968 and least extreme in 1976. The proportion of blacks requiring reassignment decreased substantially from 1968 to 1972 and slightly during the next 4 years, while the proportion of Hispanos decreased slightly from 1968 to 1972 and increased thereafter. Hence, in the South, dissimilarity of Hispanos and blacks approached the same level.

Midwest

Districts in the Midwest enrolled 20-25% of all black students in the universe but only 7-8% of all Hispanic students. More than 90% of blacks in this region, but 75-80% of Hispanos, were in large, central city districts. While Chicago and Denver accounted for slightly more than half of Hispanos in the Midwest, more than 80 percent of the blacks in the Midwest were in these two districts. Hence, there was separation of blacks and Hispanos between districts.

Isolation In the Midwest a significantly higher proportion of blacks than Hispanos were in predominantly minority schools. However, the proportions of blacks decreased, while the proportion of Hispanos increased.

Segregation from other-race students Segregation of blacks from students of other races was greater than segregation of Hispanos from other races, but segregation of blacks decreased, while segregation of Hispanos increased.

Segregation from whites In the Midwest, Hispanos showed very little segregation from whites, while blacks showed a high degree of segregation from whites. Nonetheless, the extent of segregation decreased for both Hispanos and blacks.

Dissimilarity In the Midwest, smaller proportions of blacks than Hispanos would be reassigned by the model assignment practice, but the proportions for both Hispanos and Blacks decreased during the period studied.

TABLE VI.6

Values of Indices of Segregation of Black Students in the Midwest*

Index/School level	1968	1972	1976
Isolation--E (B,H,50%)			
All schools	.940	.902	.880
Elementary schools	.961	.934	.918
Secondary schools	.896	.851	.818
Segregation From non-blacks--R(B,NB)			
All schools	.778	.724	.676
Elementary schools	.837	.797	.754
Secondary schools	.661	.603	.532
From whites--R(B,W)			
All schools	.816	.768	.710
Elementary schools	.876	.837	.789
Secondary schools	.704	.660	.579
Dissimilarity--D(B,T)			
All schools	.417	.360	.323
Elementary schools	.436	.388	.356
Secondary schools	.375	.311	.275

*Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.

Southwest (Table VI.7)

Districts in the Southwest enrolled 38% of all black students in the universe in 1968 and 33% in 1976 compared with 65% of Hispanic students in 1968 and 69% in 1976. Blacks were considerably more concentrated in large, central city districts than were Hispanos (78% in 1968 and 70% in 1976 compared with slightly more than half for Hispanos for both years). Similarly, more than 83% of blacks, but 60-62% of Hispanics, were in large districts.

Isolation in the Southwest, the proportion of blacks in predominantly minority schools was greater than the proportion of Hispanos. However, while the proportion of blacks decreased, the proportion of Hispanos increased, resulting in a narrowing of the gap between black and Hispanic isolation.

Segregation from other-race students: Segregation of blacks from students of other races was more severe than segregation of Hispanos from other races. Segregation of both groups decreased, with segregation of blacks from others decreasing more than segregation of Hispanos from others, but the rates of decrease slowed over the 8-year period.

TABLE VI.7

Values Of Indices Of Segregation Of Black Students In The Southwest*

Index/School level	1968	1972	1976
Isolation—E(B,M,30%)			
All Schools	.820	.764	.774
Elementary Schools	.871	.832	.807
Secondary Schools	.737	.688	.708
R Index			
From non-blacks—R(B,NB)			
All Schools	.393	.449	.368
Elementary Schools	.637	.504	.411
Secondary Schools	.526	.374	.297
From whites—R(B,W)			
All Schools	.675	.501	.406
Elementary Schools	.726	.567	.411
Secondary Schools	.599	.422	.330
Dissimilarity—D(B,T)			
All Schools	.546	.420	.365
Elementary Schools	.562	.449	.396
Secondary Schools	.517	.377	.310

*Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.

Dissimilarity In the Southwest larger proportions of blacks than Hispanos would be reassigned to schools by the model assignment practice. However, the proportions of both groups decreased.

Trends in Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollments (Sample II)

Comparison of segregation of blacks with segregation of Hispanos in the ten school districts having the largest number of Hispanic students highlights a major problem for desegregation. For many years desegregation activities have concentrated on black/white desegregation, often without considering the impact on other racial groups. This is clearly an inequitable application of Federal civil rights statutes.

Isolation (Table VI.8)

The proportion of black students in predominantly minority schools in sample II districts generally was larger than the proportion of Hispanic students. However, while isolation of Hispanos increased, isolation of blacks decreased. This was probably the result of desegregation activities that have concentrated on blacks rather than Hispanos.

Albuquerque and New York City have always shown slightly less isolation of blacks than of Hispanos. In 1972 and 1976, Hillsborough and Denver also showed less isolation of blacks than Hispanos.

TABLE VI.8.

Isolation of Black Students in Predominantly Minority Schools in School Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollment (Sample II): Values of E (0.11.50*)

District	1968	1972	1976
Los Angeles Unified	0.95	0.92	0.90
San Diego City Unified	0.75	0.68	0.65
Denver	0.80	0.54	0.51
Dade County (Miami)	0.88	0.76	0.81
Hillsborough, Florida (Tampa)	0.82	0.04	0.11
Chicago City	0.97	0.98	0.99
Albuquerque	0.72	0.59	0.49
New York City	0.80	0.83	0.897
Dallas ISD	0.98	0.85	0.80
Houston ISD	0.95	0.91	0.91
	0.86	0.71	0.70
Average for Sample II*	0.90	0.87	0.88
Weighted Average for Sample II**			

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the proportion of black students in predominantly minority schools.
*Average per district proportion of Hispanic students in predominantly minority schools.
**Proportion of blacks in predominatly minority schools for Sample II districts.

TABLE VI.9

Segregation of Black Students From Non-Black Students in School Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollments (Sample II): Values of R (R.NB)

District	1968	1972	1976
Los Angeles Unified	0.77	0.73	0.64
San Diego City Unified	0.48	0.41	0.31
Denver	0.38	0.32	0.20
Dade County (Miami)	0.79	0.41	0.43
Hillsborough, Florida (Tampa)	0.75	0.02	0.07
Chicago City	0.83	0.84	0.84
Albuquerque	0.18	0.11	0.09
New York City	0.31	0.31	0.33
Dallas ISD	0.85	0.68	0.50
Houston ISD	0.85	0.69	0.62
Average for Sample II*	0.64	0.45	0.40
Weighted Average for Sample II**	0.64	0.56	0.54

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation.
*Segregation in the average district.
**Segregation of the average black student in Sample II districts.

Segregation from Other-Race Students (Table VI.9)

Segregation of blacks from non-blacks generally was greater than segregation of Hispanos from non-Hispanos. However, while segregation of Hispanos changed little or not at all, segregation of blacks decreased. As a result, several cities showed less segregation of blacks than Hispanos.

In 1968, Albuquerque and New York City showed less segregation of blacks. Albuquerque continued to show less black segregation even though segregation of Hispanos decreased; while New York City showed greater segregation of blacks than Hispanos in 1972 and 1976.

In 1972, Hillsborough showed less segregation of blacks than Hispanos. However, during the next 4 years, segregation of blacks increased more than did segregation of Hispanos, and it is likely that black segregation soon will exceed Hispanic segregation in that district.

Denver showed slightly higher black segregation in 1972 and slightly lower black segregation 4 years later. This resulted from a steady decline in black segregation while Hispanic segregation was increasing, then decreasing.

Segregation from Whites (Table VI.10)

Generally, in districts having large Hispanic enrollments, blacks were more segregated from whites than were Hispanos. However, with a few exceptions, segregation for both blacks and Hispanos decreased during the period studied. New York City showed less segregation of blacks in 1968; however, segregation of blacks increased while segregation of Hispanos decreased, so that by 1976, segregation of blacks from whites was greater.

Segregation of both blacks and Hispanos decreased in Albuquerque, but the decrease for blacks was much more rapid. As a result, blacks were less segregated than Hispanos in 1972 and significantly less segregated 4 years later.

In 1968, Hillsborough showed high segregation of blacks from whites and very low segregation of Hispanos from whites. During the next 4 years, segregation of blacks decreased dramatically while segregation of Hispanos increased, so that by 1972 blacks were less segregated than Hispanos. From 1972 to 1976, segregation of both groups increased but Hispanos remained more segregated than blacks.

Denver showed dramatic desegregation of blacks between 1968 and 1976. In 1968, segregation of blacks was quite high, while in 1976, it was negligible. Segregation of Hispanos in Denver increased slightly from 1968 to 1972, then dropped substantially in 1976. Nonetheless, segregation of blacks remained lower than segregation of Hispanos.

TABLE VI.10.

Segregation of Black Students from White Students in School Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollments (Sample II): Values of R (B,W)

District	1968	1972	1976
Los Angeles Unified	0.86	0.80	0.70
San Diego City Unified	0.66	0.35	0.47
Denver	0.69	0.33	0.01
Dade County (Miami)	0.80	0.44	0.44
Hillsborough, Florida (Tampa)	0.78	0.03	0.08
Chicago City	0.86	0.87	0.88
Albuquerque	0.43	0.27	0.12
New York City	0.47	0.48	0.51
Dallas ISD	0.91	0.72	0.50
Houston ISD	0.89	0.74	0.66
Average for Sample II*	0.73	0.52	0.44
Weighted Average for Sample II**	0.73	0.65	0.63

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the segregation
*Segregation in the average district.
**Segregation of the average black student in Sample II districts.

Dissimilarity (Table VI.11)

In 1968 the Dissimilarity Index was greater for blacks than for Hispanos in 8 of the 10 school districts. Notably, Chicago and New York City showed less dissimilarity for blacks. By 1972 half the districts—Hillsborough, Chicago, New York City, Dallas, and Houston—showed lower levels of dissimilarity for blacks. Hence, in these districts blacks were more likely to be assigned to schools in proportion to the school size than were Hispanos. This trend continued into 1976.

TABLE VI.11

Dissimilarity of Black Student Assignment from Model Practice in School Districts Having Large Hispanic Enrollments (Sample II)--D(B,T)

District	1968	1972	1976
Los Angeles Unified	0.67	0.62	0.57
San Diego City Unified	0.64	0.55	0.44
Denver	0.68	0.44	0.40
Dade County (Miami)	0.64	0.44	0.43
Hillsborough, Florida (Tampa)	0.66	0.11	0.19
Chicago City	0.42	0.38	0.36
Albuquerque	0.53	0.46	0.34
New York City	0.32	0.30	0.30
Dallas ISD	0.63	0.47	0.34
Houston ISD	0.60	0.46	0.41
Average for Sample II*	0.58	0.42	0.38
Weighted Average for Sample II**	0.47	0.40	0.37

Note: The higher the value of the index, the greater the divergence from the model assignment practice.
*Average per district.
**Average per black student.

Tri-Ethnic District Composition and Patterns of Segregation

Segregation in public schools is a condition in which different racial groups attend separate schools. When there are only two major racial groups in a schools system, separation is obviously between the two groups. In these situations, the extent of segregation is fairly easy to determine and remedies are easy to describe (even if difficult to implement). When a third (or fourth) racial group appears, segregation may be described as the separation of each group from all others or the separation of each group from each of the others. The variety of indices used in this study are a direct result of this complexity.

Describing segregation in districts enrolling three racial groups becomes more complex when value judgments are made. Any segregation of one group from any other group may be considered detrimental. Alternatively, a segregation of one group from the third group may be considered detrimental.

The universe of districts used in this study was composed of three major racial groups. In 1976 the universe was 23% Hispano, 22% black, and 51% white. Hence, desegregation in these districts is a complex, tri-ethnic problem. The problem is further complicated because most desegregation activities have concentrated on desegregation of blacks and have not necessarily considered the impact on Hispanos. This probably is partly because segregation of blacks has been more severe. Nonetheless, Hispanic segregation is a problem that and cannot be ignored.

Consider, for example, the city of San Diego.* The percentage of blacks in San Diego very nearly equaled the percentage of Hispanos. In 1968, 10.1% of San Diego students were Hispano while 11.6% were black, and in 1976, 14.0% were Hispano and 14.5% were black. Segregation of blacks as

*San Diego has been used for illustrative purposes; other school districts undoubtedly show the same problems.

measured by the R indices was greater than that of Hispanos in both 1968 and 1976. However, black segregation decreased over that 8-year period while Hispanic segregation increased. In 1974 San Diego was placed under a court order to desegregate. The remedial actions ordered by the court, or attempted by the district, apparently were disadvantageous for Hispanos.**

San Diego has become less white. Whatever factors have operated in the district to control assignment of students to schools have caused the Hispanic community to absorb the entire burden of this loss. Moreover, this loss has not been compensated by an increased exposure to other racial groups.

A look at the racial composition of the school for the average Hispano and average black student in San Diego gives some indication of what occurred (Table VI.12). In 1968 the average Hispanic student was in a school that was 57.8% white, 20.0% black, and 19.7% Hispano; in 1976 these figures were 46.2% white, 19.0% black and 29.1 Hispanos. Obviously, Hispanos were more isolated in 1976 than in 1968. The decrease in the average proportion of whites in schools attended by Hispanos exceeded the overall decrease in whites in the district. In 1968 the average black student in San Diego was in a school that was 53.8% black, 26.3% white, and 18.6% Hispano, while in 1976 those figures were 41.4% black, 35.0% white, and 18.2% Hispano. Hence, blacks were less isolated in predominantly minority schools in 1976 than in 1968. The reduction in isolation was largely the result of an increase in white enrollment in the school attended by the average black student.

**This observation considers segregation as a social ill, regadless of the racial groups involved. One might consider an increased concentration of Hispanos as advantageous to this Hispanic community, in which case desegregation of blacks in San Diego has benefited the Hispanic community.

This data demonstrates the complexity of tri-ethnic desegregation and provides an example of inequitable and perhaps inappropriate application of civil rights laws. Enforcement activities have focused on segregated school systems that primarily separate blacks from whites. The obvious remedy has been desegregation by mixing blacks and whites, in hopes that this will provide equal educational opportunity for all. Such remedy ignores the role of other-race students, in this case Hispanos. As a result, Hispanos have not received some of the benefits of desegregation.

If the nation's public schools are to provide equal educational opportunity by providing desegregated schools, efforts must be broadened to embrace students of other racial groups.

TABLE VI.12

Composition Of Schools In San Diego For The Average Hispanic And Black Student

Hispanic and Black Student by year of Survey	Hispano	Black	White	Other
Average Hispanic Student				
1968	19.7%	20.0%	57.8%	02.5%
1976	29.1%	19.0%	46.2%	05.7%
Average black student				
1968	18.6%	53.8%	26.3%	01.3%
1976	18.2%	41.4%	35.0%	05.4%

CHAPTER VII.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY AND FUTURE RESEARCH

RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has uncovered several areas for which policy development could be of significant benefit. It has also identified some areas needing further research. In addition, a summary of areas for further research which may not be directly related to policy development are identified.

Policy Recommendations

Over the period studied (1968-76) the level of segregation of Hispanos and the level of segregation of blacks converged. If segregation in the public schools is to be eliminated, segregation of Hispanos cannot be ignored. Desegregation activities should be reexamined for their impact on Hispanic racial groups. Districts that have accomplished desegregation of blacks without increasing segregation of Hispanos should be studied to determine what approaches have worked. These school systems should be used as models for developing policies and procedures that will equalize impact of the desegregation of Hispanos and blacks.

The relationship between disciplinary actions and segregation suggests that student behavior or disciplinary policies are different in low segregation schools than high segregation schools. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights has performed several case studies which have focused on this and other problems caused by desegregation. These studies should be expanded to determine what policies and procedures avoid these and other problems. Combining these with the procedures that effect simultaneous desegregation of Hispanos and blacks could produce guidelines for racially balanced schools.

The limited English language ability of Hispanic students affect many aspects of their education. Several evaluations of the relationship between segregation and school practices suggest even stronger relationships between English language ability and the education of Hispanos. For example, it appears that some Hispanos in desegregated schools may be misclassified for special education as a result of language difficulties. The Education of the Handicapped Act (P.L. 94-142) provides a general framework for identifying handicapped students and assessing their needs. This general framework should prevent misidentification of Hispanos as a result of English language deficiencies. However, specific regulations are available only for Specific Learning Disabilities. Tentative questions have been raised by the data to further investigate language and special education for areas of possible misclassification and confluence.

English-language deficiencies appear to affect performance of Hispanic students to a greater extent than does segregation. If this conclusion is supported by further research, evaluations of the effectiveness of bilingual education and English as a second language programs should be conducted. The features of programs that improve subsequent performance of Hispanos should be investigated, and these features should be used as a model for future policy development in this area. In addition, our conclusions suggest that the provision of equal educational opportunity is more favorably enhanced through bilingual education or ESL than only through the desegregation of our community. Desegregation among Hispanic population groups can do great disservice if not reinforced with bilingual education or ESL.

Inasmuch as DHEW/OCR does not differentiate between bilingual education and ESL, it is important to further investigate the differential effects each of these program types aides LEP students. Moreover, it should be the policy of the Office for Civil Rights to separate these categories in future

surveys. Significant areas for policy development can emanate from a study of this kind if the variables under study were more carefully constructed in Federal Government surveys.

Areas for Further Research

This study covered many areas related to segregation of Hispanos in public elementary and secondary schools, but limitations on both time and funding prevented intensive investigation of several promising areas. Areas in which further research would be beneficial are:

- Continued investigation of segregation trends using data for 1978 and subsequent schools years
- Studies of total segregation of Hispanic students, including between-district segregation
- More intensive studies of segregation in specific regions (e.g., the South and Midwest)
- Examination of segregation trends for a larger sample of blacks
- Further investigation of the relationship between segregation and school practices
- School-level studies of isolation of Hispanic staff in 1968 and 1972
- More intensive examination of tri-ethnic composition and segregation patterns
- Examination of school districts with 5% Hispanic enrollment or above, but under 3000 total enrollment.

An obvious area for further research in Hispanic segregation trends is a study of more recent data. The Office for Civil Rights has continued its biennial study of public elementary and secondary school districts. When available, the 1978 survey should be examined to determine if the trends over the 1968-76 period continued over the next two years.

Segregation of Hispanos is not limited to the within-district segregation examined by this study. Summary statistics for the universe used in this study indicate extensive separation of Hispanos from other racial/groups between districts. This study could be expanded by evaluating total segregation of Hispanos both between and within districts.

More extensive investigation of regional segregation trends is another promising area for further research. For example, more intensive investigation using larger samples and field studies could identify the factors contributing to the relatively high level of Hispanic segregation and poor records of performance observed in the South. Further, since large numbers of Hispanic students in the Midwest were excluded by the definition of the universe, a better picture of Hispanic segregation in this region could be developed by using a less restrictive sample.

Segregation in districts having large Hispanic enrollments warrants further investigation. This study was weakened by a lack of specific information on desegregation activities in the cities; the findings could be significantly enhanced by relating specific features of desegregation plans to segregation trends. For example, desegregation plans in three cities, which have shown noteworthy trends--Chicago, Denver, and Dallas--should be investigated and related to the desegregation observed. Further study also should examine the effects of tri-ethnic composition of districts and segregation patterns. Further investigation of desegregation activities in

Denver, a city that shows evidence of having avoided the problems posed by tri-ethnic composition, could prove useful fore other districts facing these

Relationships between segregation and specific school practices were uncovered in this study. However, the effects of other district characteristics on school practices were not examined. For example, the apparent relationship between segregation and bilingual education may be determined by other factors such as district size, and/or metropolitan status. Further investigation that examines several relationships while controlling other variables would be useful.

The most severe limitation in comparing trends of segregation of blacks and Hispanos was the use of the same set of districts to study both groups. Although these districts provided good coverage of Hispanos, the poor coverage of blacks may have caused the trends observed for blacks to be less accurate than those for Hispanos. A parallel study of black segregation based on samples that provide better coverage of blacks would significantly enhance comparative trend evaluation. Moreover, such a study could address the questions that relate educational outcomes forblacks to segregation. A suitable sample for blacks was developed in the early stages of this study but could not be evaluated because of limitations on time and funds.

In the evaluation of Hispanic staff and pupil assignment, this study dealt with large aggregate groups of schools. Separation of staff and students within the groups at the school level might show quite different results. Further research of staff information could also address the question of whether or not Hispanic staff are segregated in employment.

The effects of tri-ethnic racial composition on segregation are significant, and segregation studies would be enhanced by further

investigation in this area. A smaller sample of districts having significant populations of three or more racial/groups could be used to examine the effects and interrelationships of segregation between each pair of racial/groups. This general study would be augmented by investigation of desegregation activities in several districts where specific desegregation plans are in effect. Investigation of desegregation activities that have decreased Hispanic segregation as well as those that have increased Hispanic segregation would be invaluable for policy development. Our limited sample III was but a beginning effort in that direction.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In summation, segregation of Hispanic students has now become a rather urgent problem. Total segregation of Hispanos, both between and within districts, is comparable to, if not greater than, segregation of blacks. In addition, there is evidence of resegregation of Hispanos. Hence, what has not been an overwhelming problem in the past has become rather critical in the present.

This report has documendted, at length, Hispanic segregation trends for an 8-year period for school districts in the country where most Hispanos attend. It has examined these districts from a cross-sectional (Sample I) as well as a longitudinal perspective (Sample V). In addition, it has looked at the ten largest school districts in the country and their Hispanic segregation trends (Sample II).*

This report clearly reveals that segregation trends for Hispanos have not dramatically changed over an eight-year period. In fact, in nearly half of the districts (Sample V) segregation has increased for Hispanos. Moreover, projections do not indicate a diminution of these trends. While the number of Hispanos continues to rise, and as they soon becom the largest racial group in the United States,* these trends may magnify.

As compared to blacks and whites, Hispanic isolation in most school districts is increasing at an even faster pace. Also, segregation trends are not consistent in tri-ethnic communities. That is, Hispanos are at

*In other reports we have qualitatively examined the dynamics of school desegregation implementation (Sample IV), and further commented on within-districts segregation trends (Sample III) for Hispanos.

*See documentation in Volume I of these reports.

times rapidly segregating from both blacks and whites in some districts, while, in other districts, segregating with one group and desegregating wit another racial group in a rather large number of districts throughout the country. It easily becomes evident that Hispanos are not been affected in the same way in most of the tri-ethnic school systems in the country.

Another finding of major consequence is that Hispanic school staff are segregated as much as Hispanic students. While the data are not available for trend analyses, this is an alarming conclusion. We have also found that other school practices are directly related to the school district level of segregation. In addition, these patterns vary considerably in different regions of the country.

While a summary of these findings may be helpful to the reader, we are careful not to simplify hundreds of tables into several paragraphs without strongly qualifying each statement. Instead, a summary is provided in chapter I of this report and in many of the concluding statements of this volume's chapters. Also, Volume I highlights these findings as it reviews other reports from the study.

It is important to stress to the reader that this report is but a beginning effort in analyzing Hispanic segregation trends. Further analyses on the data presented is strongly encouraged. The tables presented in the appendices should serve as a resource for more extensive examination.